

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097027 2

CARSWELL Co., Limited
Bookbinders,
PRINTERS,
LAW BOOKS,
PUBLISHERS, etc. TORONTO
ONT.





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

Ballantyne Press

**BALLANTYNE AND HANSON, EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON**

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES.

JULY — OCTOBER.

MDCCCLXXIX.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES.

DUBLIN: M. H. GILL & SON.

1879.

THEORY OF THE

UNIVERSITY

OF THE

STATE

OF

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1879.

ART. I.—THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC; SHOULD IT BE
PROHIBITED?

*Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on
Intemperance. London, 1879.*

(The question of the liquor traffic is one of such extreme importance at this moment that we are glad to insert an Article in which the facts of the subject are ably dealt with.)

AS the publication of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance is once more attracting considerable attention to the question of "How to deal with the liquor traffic," it may not be out of place to give a brief statement of the argument in favour of one proposed solution which has the recommendation of being the only one which has hitherto proved practically successful to any appreciable extent. Such a statement seems the more desirable—1st, Because the Lords' Committee, while they devote a considerable space in their Report to a discussion of permissive local prohibition, refer only incidentally to total imperial prohibition; and 2d, Because, although in dealing with the question of drunkenness and its attendant evils, all recent writers and speakers of note (Lord Aberdare, Mr. Lowe, M.P., Mr. W. E. Forster, M.P., Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., and Mr. Peek in particular,) have been agreed in deeming it necessary that some reference should be made to total prohibition, unfortunately each has thought it sufficient to do little more than express his opinion that such a thing would be impracticable—*i.e.*, could not be enforced if adopted—without favouring us with the reasons

that have induced him to form that opinion. Mr. Peek does indeed urge that

Any legislation in the shape of entire prohibition, except under most exceptional and rare circumstances, has one fatal fault—namely, that it goes far beyond the general feeling of the country, while in every self-governed state the first essential to all successful reforms is that they shall have the support of public opinion. Any legislation or any attempt at legislation without such support must fail, and such will often produce a reaction of feeling which hinders not only legislative progress, but also the very formation of that opinion which is so desirable.*

No one, however, imagines that there will be any legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic—engrafted as it is by custom and prejudice into the very constitution of the nation—until it has “the support of public opinion,” and is the expression of “the general feeling of the country.” There will ever be such a desire to postpone as long as may be the adoption of so stringent a remedy, that Parliament will never pass it until a large majority of the people declare themselves in its favour and demand its enactment.† The objection is groundless against everything but immediate prohibition, unless it can be proved that public opinion never will be in its favour, and this cannot be done without first showing that prohibition is unnecessary—that is, that our national intemperance can be cured by some other means, or that the evil is not so great as to justify such a radical measure. For, as has been fairly urged,‡ if prohibition is necessary, all objections against it on the ground of impracticability are a reflection on our intelligence and patriotism: for they assume that the people are either too stupid to be convinced, or that, if convinced, they have neither sense nor spirit enough to act upon their convictions. No change of law is impracticable which depends on the voice of the people, guided by the information they possess. It may, for lack of acquaintance with the facts, be impracticable at one time; but that is only the greater reason why agitation should be continued, and everything done that may impart light, so that the necessary legislation may be rendered practicable and certain.

The best reply to the objection that prohibition is impracticable, however, is that in the United States of America it has been adopted, and is remarkably successful, and there is not

* Article in the *Contemporary Review*, December, 1876.

† The Parliamentary History of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill is an illustration of this.

‡ “Christendom and the Drink Curse,” by the Rev. D. Burns, M.A., F.S.S.

sufficient difference in the constitution, circumstances, and habits of the two peoples to justify the opinion that what has been done there cannot be done here.

The opinion, (held also by Mr. Chamberlain and apparently by Mr. John Bright), that the advocacy of an extreme measure hinders the adoption of a moderate one, is based on the assumption that the prospect of the extreme measure being accepted is utterly utopian and hopeless: failing that, it is not consistent with general experience. The fact is, it is the advocacy of so-called extreme measures that make moderate measures possible. We are so much a people of compromise, and in legislation we so seldom, if ever, carry a principle to its logical conclusion, that it has become almost a maxim that more should be asked for than is expected, knowing that what is granted is usually short of, but in proportion to, what is demanded. The prominent position of the temperance question to-day and recent legislation in reference to licensing are both chiefly owing to the persistent agitation of teetotalers and prohibitionists. Agitation for measures of reform is the only means by which public opinion can be educated up to the required standard; and action in such matters must be taken by the few. "The history of minorities," it has been well said, "is the history of success." Those who hold that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is the only remedy for intemperance are in duty bound to publish that conviction, but not necessarily to demand that it be immediately acted upon. No wise reformer would, if he had the power, place on the Statute Book any law in *opposition* to public opinion. He will prefer getting the improvement by instalments (as large and as frequent as practicable); never omitting to let it be distinctly understood that they are only instalments and not settlements—instalments that are only satisfactory in proportion as they approach his ultimate ideal. There is a wide distinction between a law in *opposition* to public opinion and one merely in *advance* of such opinion. In the one case dislike and evasion will almost certainly result, while in the other, if the law be just and based on sound principles, its effect may be instructive and elevating.

Coming to the question of the right of the people to totally prohibit the sale of drink, we find that while the Lords' Committee admit that

If the common sale of alcoholic liquors be a thing so universally pernicious, and so incapable of regulation as the advocates of the Permissive Bill maintain that it is, then it should be universally prohibited by a general Act of the Legislature (p. xxi.).

they deny that it is accompanied by such evils as to justify its prohibition, and they declare that

It does not seem, therefore, either just or expedient that the purchase and moderate use of liquor by the majority of persons should be prevented because there are some who abuse it to their own hurt or that of others.

Unquestionably there is a certain undefined and not very logical opinion generally held that the legislature has no right to prevent people getting what they like to drink. Mr. Lowe, advocating free-trade in drink, states that

In intemperance we have to deal not with a wrong that we can redress, nor with a crime which we can punish, but a vice, an evil habit, which is not within the reach of the law without an intolerable inroad on personal liberty.*

Lord Aberdare put the issue thus to one of the witnesses before the Committee :

The question is whether it is right to impose upon a vast number of people who find innocent enjoyment in drink an amount of self-denial which they do not seek themselves, and which they would consider a hardship.

And Mr. W. E. Forster, speaking at Bradford on Prohibition, said :

He would not at that time and place say how far it was or was not the province of the law to interfere between men and the getting of drink if they wished to take it, but in vindication of himself he would state that he still attached meaning to the old phrase, "Liberty of the subject," and that he still thought there ought to be very strong grounds indeed to justify the law coming to any man and saying, "We will choose what you eat and drink and wear." He had, therefore, very great doubts whether the law could step in to prevent liquor being sold, and consequently to prevent its being bought.†

This question of "the liberty of the subject" touches the fundamental principle upon which civilised society is based, and as it is made the groundwork of many objections to prohibition, it will be well, before going further, to briefly consider the bases of government and legislation, and their bearing on the suppression of evil—with special reference to the evil of intemperance.

If it be correct that the object of good government is to promote the well-being of the subject by guarding liberties, virtue, and morals, by affording protection to life and property, and by

* *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1877.

† November 14th, 1878.

encouraging the growth of that which will increase the general happiness and prosperity, it is within the province of a Government, indeed it is its duty, to sanction only such occupations as will be in conformity with the general well-being, and to prohibit those the consequences of which will be more injurious than beneficial to the people. Government implies a limitation of freedom, and individual liberty must give way to the good of the State. Legitimate civil liberty being defined as freedom to do whatsoever is wished so far and so long as its being done does not injuriously affect the well-being, or interfere with the same liberty of the rest of the community, law is essential to such liberty, and there will be no opposition between good laws and true civil liberty. All legislative coercion and interference is a restraint, but it is a restraint which is necessary for the prevention of greater evils.* Were human nature perfect there would be no necessity for restrictive legislation of any kind, because every man would be able to do as he wished, since he would wish to do only what was right and just.

No one has a right to demand that his wishes shall be gratified at the expense of the general weal. However moderately a man may indulge in the use of alcoholic liquors, and however beneficial to himself he may imagine that indulgence to be, he has no right to demand that their public sale shall be allowed, in order that he may provide himself with them, when it has been proved that society at large is injuriously affected by such sale.† If it is found that the evil occasioned by the traffic—material, physical, social, and moral—far outweighs any real or supposed benefits that are derived therefrom, and that no other remedy has proved, or is likely to prove successful, the Government will be justified in prohibiting the sale, even for moderate use, of that which in so many cases leads to mischief being done. And it will be no valid reason for any one to urge in opposition to such prohibition that *they* will not exceed proper limits. The point at issue is not, as it is often put, whether because one man likes beer and two do not, the two should prevent the one from getting his beer. It is not a question of individual likes and dislikes, but of effects on others. If the drink was merely injurious to those who took it, any one could by abstaining protect himself against it ; but it is also socially injurious, and

* "All that makes existence valuable to any one, depends on the enforcement of restraints upon the actions of other people."—J. S. Mill "On Liberty," p. 3. People's edition.

† "Every public-house tends to aggravate the public rates, and to create disorder ; and it also causes an additional necessity for the police."—Mr. Bruce's (now Lord Aberdare) speech in the House of Commons, April 3, 1871.

society is powerless to protect itself without the aid of law. Temperance reformers have no desire to interfere with what a man "shall eat, drink, or wear ;" but if his eating, drinking, or wearing interferes with them by injuriously affecting the community, then they are bound to step in and claim respect for their liberty, and demand that that injury shall cease, and if it cannot cease without the prohibition of the sale of a particular article of diet or clothing, such sale must be prohibited. If drink can be obtained and used in such a way that no one suffers besides the drinker, interference might be unnecessary and unjust : but, if in order to supply the wants of himself and others like him, places are opened which are a nuisance and result in evil to the community, it will be justified in suppressing them, and the reply to the objector is, "If you want these drinks you must devise some means whereby you may obtain them without subjecting others to injury or annoyance : failing that you must do without them." At the present time to sell bad meat, to expose obscene pictures, or to keep gunpowder or petroleum in large quantities, is not allowed by law. Men may use these things themselves, they may eat bad food, have obscene pictures in their house for their own gratification, and use gunpowder and petroleum, but they may not keep, expose, or sell them as they like. Why ? Because doing so would affect the moral or physical well-being of others, and the moment that is done the law steps in. We may admit, in reply to an objection frequently raised against legislation on questions of morality and conduct, that no laws can make a nation righteous ; but they can do much to facilitate its becoming and remaining so. Man is a free agent, and on questions of morality and conscience he cannot be coerced ; but he may be induced and led : he is susceptible to outward influence. Inducements may be held out to him, or obstacles placed in his way, that will lead him to adopt this course of conduct and abandon that. This indicates the legitimate sphere of government. It should respect man's freedom ; yet, as Mr. Gladstone put it, "It ought to make it easy for him to do what is right, and difficult for him to do wrong."

The argument for prohibition may now be formulated thus:—

I. The evils of the drinking system are so terrible, so widespread, and so antagonistic to the welfare of the nation that they must be remedied at almost any cost.

II. No system of regulating the Traffic, nor any efforts of social and moral reformers have counteracted, or can ever effectually counteract the evils of intemperance, so long as the sale of drink is allowed.

III. The Total Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is essential

to success in grappling with the evils of the drinking system—it would enable the nation to abolish intemperance, and obviate the injury it does.

The first point needs little enforcement, for the effect of the liquor traffic in barricading all paths of progress, in counteracting the influence and stunting the growth of freedom, morality, and virtue, and in encouraging the development of the worst phases of man's character, is well known. To the ruin engendered by drunkenness all bear witness. To quote the eloquent words of Canon Farrar :

From the army, from the navy, from great cities, from country villages, from the police, from guardians of the poor, from manufacturers, from merchants, from all large employers of labour, from physicians, from judges, from the clergy of every denomination, and most often and most bitterly from the working men themselves, come pouring in the accumulated testimonies—emphatic, heartrending, unmistakable, reiterated—to the prevalence, to the increase, to the deadliness of this degrading sin.

Nevertheless a summary of the more striking facts is necessary for the completeness of the argument.

As a nation we spend 140,000,000*l.* a year on alcoholic liquors. The sum spent during the last four years would have purchased all the railways in the country, and the sum spent during the last six years would have paid off the National Debt. Now, if these liquors are practically useless—as many affirm they are—if they answer no good purpose, being at best only a luxury, that sum, with the exception of the portion (about 34,000,000*l.*) which yearly accrues to the revenue, represents a great waste. The medical declaration extensively signed by the leading members of the medical profession in 1846 stated that

The most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits, or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, &c.; that total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and intoxicating beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality, and the happiness of the human race.

The accuracy of these opinions has been abundantly confirmed by subsequent experience and research. Stronger evidence as to the practical uselessness of alcoholic liquors as beverages is, however, not required, than that given before the Lords' Committee by the eminent medical authorities who attended for the purpose. They united in declaring their conviction that

Alcohol does not build up any tissue in the body.* In cold weather its effect is to lower the temperature of the body and not to raise it, as is popularly believed.† It is not only useless, but positively injurious, in prolonged muscular exertion.‡

And the opinions expressed in the following opinions are singularly harmonious and emphatic :—

Dr. Brunton.—In small quantities, I believe it may be taken as a luxury without doing any harm : the quantity, however, is very small.§

Dr. Burdon-Sanderson.—My belief is that upon the whole the human race would be situated just as favourably if the use of alcohol did not exist. I think that for two reasons. In the first place, because the evils certainly preponderate over the benefits—that is certainly one reason ; and the other consideration is simply that all the benefits are dispensable benefits. There is no benefit which we derive from alcohol in a state of health which we could not do without ; although we could not possibly do without the use of alcohol in disease.||

Sir Wm. Gull.—I should say from my experience that it (alcohol) is the most deleterious agent that we are aware of in this country.¶

Sir Henry Thompson.—I think a man is generally better without alcoholic drinks.**

Dr. W. B. Richardson expressed his conviction that if all the alcoholic liquor in the world could be tapped off and let flow and disappear, the world would be much the better for it ; we should be stronger and healthier, and life would be lengthened.††

The value of medical opinion as to the necessity or desirability of using alcoholic liquors as beverages is, after all, quite subordinate to the testimony of practical experience. The majority of medical men have paid little attention to the subject, and consequently really know little of it ; but the few who have studied it declare almost unanimously in favour of the views expressed above.‡‡

* Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, Third Report, p. 163. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 238.

† Dr. Brunton, Third Report, pp. 149, 150. Sir Wm. Gull, Third Report, p. 246. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 237.

‡ Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, Third Report, p. 165. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 237.

§ Third Report, p. 156.

|| Third Report, p. 166.

¶ Third Report, p. 245.

** Fourth Report, p. 70.

†† Fourth Report, pp. 242, 243.

‡‡ According to the Archbishop of York, Sir James Paget declined to give evidence before the Lords' Committee, because he had given no special attention to the question ; and Sir Wm. Gull in his evidence said : "I do not know how alcohol does act upon the body altogether. I do not think it is known, but I know it is a most deleterious poison" (Third Report, p. 246).

That these drinks are not a necessity seems clear from the fact that whole nations in various parts of the world pass through life without them. Further, if they are in any degree beneficial to health, if they assist any part of our system in the discharge of its functions, if they contribute to any appreciable extent to keep our bodies or minds in proper working order, either by direct assistance or by protecting them from injury, it must follow that any one who is deprived of these liquors must be so much the worse in proportion to the benefit to be derived from them. Nothing can be a benefit of which it is no loss to be deprived. In our own country hundreds of thousands of people do not drink intoxicating liquors, nor are they provided with a substitute, yet it has never been proved that they are, in consequence of their non-use of these liquors, in any way, morally or physically, incapacitated for the discharge of all the duties of life. On the contrary, it has been conclusively proved that, compared with those who do take the drink, even in what is called a "proper way," they are the healthier, the less injurious, and the more moral citizens. They suffer less from sickness and disease, they are longer lived, and their names are far less frequently found in the list of those who are known as our pauper and criminal classes.

Commercially, the waste of 140,000,000*l.* annually is a great strain on the financial stability of the nation; and the strain is at least doubled by the indirect loss involved in that waste.

Three-fourths of our pauperism and crime and one-third of our lunacy are distinctly traceable to the drinking system.*

A moderate estimate places the number of deaths annually resulting, directly and indirectly, from the use of intoxicating drinks at 100,000.†

These are short statements of serious facts: space will not allow more. This waste, pauperism, crime, insanity, and pre-

* 1. In the Convocation of Canterbury Report on Intemperance the testimony of 119 governors of workhouses is quoted. Of these 80 state the proportion of pauperism that they consider to be the result of intemperance, not one gives it lower than one-half, and the average estimate is 73 per cent.

2. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, at the Durham Spring Assizes, in 1877, said: "If we could make England sober we might shut up nine-tenths of our gaols." Again, at the Bristol Autumn Assizes last year he made the same statement, adding, "The large majority of criminal cases began or ended or were connected with the public-house or drunkenness."

† 1. See Paper read by Mr. Norman Kerr, M.D., at the Social Science Congress at Cheltenham, October 29th, 1878, on "The Mortality from Intemperance;" and the discussion.

2. The Official Returns of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution (established 1840) show a mortality in the moderate

mature death are a terrible cost and burden to the nation and to each individual as part of it. They weight us seriously in the race of competition with other nations; in times of prosperity they drag us down, and in bad times they drive us still deeper into the mire. What this nation has suffered and is suffering from the waste of energy and time, from the "intellectual pauperism," and from the deterioration in manual dexterity amongst its trading and working classes in consequence of their drinking customs, can never be estimated. The lack of what might have been done and of what now ought to be done for English commerce is being severely felt in this time of depression and severe competition. In the struggle for commercial supremacy which is becoming so fierce we are by no means so far ahead of other competitors as we used to be, and the danger is that, unless we can keep both masters and workmen away from the drink—unless we can ensure that our inventors, designers and artisans shall have clear heads and steady hands—we shall, in spite of our natural advantages, have to rank second to nations with whom the worship of Bacchus has not become a mania and a crime.

Nor is this all. Since 1860 female intemperance has in-

drinking section of those insured of 17 per cent. higher than in the abstaining section.

3. About 130,000 children die in England every year before they are twelve months old. In March, 1876, the Deputy-Coroner for Middlesex stated that in that district alone 300 children were suffocated annually in bed, seven-tenths of these cases occurring on Sunday mornings, and that such cases were very often the outcome of parental intemperance.

4. "Seven-eighths of the persons run over in the streets of London are drunk when they fall under the horses' hoofs or carriage wheels."—*The Lancet*, June, 1868.

5. G. H. B. McLeod, Regius Professor of Surgery in the University of Glasgow (February, 1874), said: "My experience is that 99 out of every 100 cases in the accident ward of our infirmary are the result of drink."

6. The mortality among publicans and their assistants is terribly high, and the death among grocers increased 10 per cent. in the first ten years after 1860, the year in which power was given them to sell wine and beer.

7. Dr. E. Lankester, Coroner for Middlesex, in "What shall we Teach," says: "The death from alcoholic poisoning in Great Britain is prodigious; it may be set down at something like one-tenth of the whole death-rate of the country." Note that this refers to "alcoholic poisoning" only, and not to the deaths indirectly caused by drink.

8. Dr. W. B. Richardson, F.R.S., says: "I do not over-estimate the facts when I say that if such a miracle could be performed in England as a general conversion to temperance, the vitality of the nation would rise one-third in value, and this without any reference to what would indirectly follow."

creased to an extent unknown before. Drunkenness in men is bad, but drunkenness in women seems worse. It is specially abhorrent and repulsive; it removes all trace of refining influence and womanly virtue; instinctively it shocks every feeling of seemliness and propriety. The evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords shows that the practice of secret drinking among women is assuming serious proportions and that it is extending in every direction.* The drunkenness of wives, mothers, and sisters is the last and worst development of our national vice. It may be unhesitatingly affirmed that the drinking system is *the* degenerating factor of the present time; for the whole machinery of social and moral reform is clogged by it. The highest development of individual and national greatness and the guarantee of full scope to the highest faculties of the human mind can never be attained while it continues; the energy and time of those who are most able and willing to labour for the exercise and advancement of the best powers of the nation are now almost entirely occupied in attempting to stem the tide of intemperance or in counter-acting the evils that flow from it.

Further, every man, woman, and child in the country is injured by it, whether they use the drink or not. *And this is the point.* The determination of some people not to perceive that this is the real issue, and the ingenuity they will exercise to put the case in any but the true light was strikingly manifested in an Article by Mr. Gray in the *Contemporary Review*, August, 1877. After describing "a large expanse of suburb," in which intoxicating drinks have been regularly and carefully used for fifteen years without resulting in more than one or two cases of drunkenness—a sketch for which we venture to assert the writer is entirely indebted to his imagination, for no one with any acquaintance with the home life of the middle-classes (to whom reference is made) will give the slightest credence to the suggestion that the suburb is a reality—he proceeds to urge

That any philanthropist should propose to take from that quiet suburb, containing, I dare say, 6000 or 8000 well-conducted human beings, the right to get their XB or their claret just as they do now—should propose, as a matter of legislation, mind, to take away that right just because they get drunk and commit crimes down in Rough's Alley, and the drink and the crime are often found connected—does seem to me a topic for invective, resentment, and comedy.†

"The drink and the crime are often found connected" forsooth! If the evidence of judges, magistrates, gaol chaplains, and

* Report p. xvi. 26. † *Contemporary Review*, August, 1877, p. 463.

governors is of any value : if there is any reliance to be placed on the testimony of prisoners themselves : if the experience of those of us who have given any attention to this question has not resulted in marvellous self-deception—it is a fact as conclusively proved as any social fact of which we have cognizance, that in four cases out of five drink and crime stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. It is because the use of drink results in injury to the community in the quiet suburb as well as in Rough's Alley : it is because no one has been able to point out a single place in the country where intoxicating drinks are in common use as beverages, and where the evils we now deplore have not been attendant thereupon : it is because of this that we justify the demand that Mr. Gray's "well-conducted human beings" shall either discover some means of exercising "the right to get their XB or their claret" without necessitating injury to others, or abandon "the right" altogether.

Abstainers who touch not the drink, and moderate drinkers who take it most sparingly, are burdened and damaged by the drinking system. Equally with the drunkard they are compelled to pay a share of the cost of the pauperism, crime, insanity, and disease caused by it. Commercially they suffer from the bad trade resulting from the waste of wealth in connection with the liquor traffic. And morally they are deteriorated by unavoidable intercourse with those who are contaminated in public-houses and drinking saloons. Their liberty is curtailed by the publican's license, and they are justified in demanding protection from injury done by the habits and practices of others.

II. No system of regulating the Traffic, nor any efforts of social or moral reformers have counteracted or can ever effectually counteract the evils of intemperance so long as the sale of drink is allowed.

The history of past legislation is very instructive as to the impossibility of effectively regulating the sale, and thereby the use, of drink. During the last 300 years a vast number of Acts of Parliament have been passed with that object, and yet nothing short of total prohibition has been devised that does or can prevent drunkenness. The place has yet to be discovered where intemperance has been suppressed, and the evils flowing from the traffic avoided under any system of regulation or license. Speaking at Oxford, Lord Aberdare recently* said :

There can be no doubt whatever, in spite of beneficial Acts of Parliament, and in spite of the action outside Parliament of a large

* November 4th, 1878.

portion of the best of the community, no successful effort has yet been made to diminish that which is perhaps the greatest of our national evils, and which is beyond all question a great national curse.

The Lords' Committee also state that

All that general legislation has been hitherto able to effect has been some improvement in public order, while it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance.*

In considering whether there is less intemperance now than there used to be, whether any improvement has resulted from recent legislation, and whether there has been any change for the better in the habits of the people, it must be remembered that a decrease in absolute reeling drunkenness, and better order in public-houses and in the streets, is no proof that there is less intemperance. Such conditions may be indicative of more stringent police regulations, of an improvement in the class of public-houses and in the character of those who keep them, and of a change in the habits of the people, but not necessarily of less drinking. The Lords' Committee report that

Recent legislation has had a beneficial effect throughout the country by producing good order in the streets, by abolishing the class of beer-houses, and by improving the character of licensed houses generally. *It is not, however, proved that it has diminished the amount of drunkenness.*†

They also state that

In England and Wales the number of persons apprehended for drunkenness was: in 1860, 88,361; in 1867, 100,357; in 1870, 131,870; and in 1875, 203,989.‡

In fact, the contrary appears to be too evident. The expenditure per head of the population on intoxicating liquors increased from 2*l.* 18*s.* 6½*d.* in 1860 to 3*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.* in 1870 and 4*l.* 9*s.* 0¼*d.* in 1876: and this is, after all, the great test. Referring, however, to this increased expenditure, the Committee remark

It is probable that a large portion represents the moderate consumption by the temperate. With increasing incomes the spending power of all classes has grown, and a higher scale of comfort has been gradually introduced. Just as the consumption of meat has increased, so has that of intoxicating liquors, but in neither of these cases does the increased general consumption necessarily imply a proportionate excess on the part of individuals.§

And they give a Table showing that the use of tea, sugar, wine, and tobacco has increased far more rapidly than the use of spirits or beer.||

* Report p. 25.

§ Report p. 10.

† Report p. 17.

|| Report p. 11.

‡ Report p. 12.

To this line of arguments and its conclusions a rejoinder may very fairly be made. Twenty years ago the people were not getting as much of the necessities and luxuries of life—tea, coffee, meat, sugar, &c.—as it was desirable they should, and the increased quantity which they have since been able to purchase represents so much more comfort and benefit to them. Mr. Caird, in his recent work on the landed interest, states that thirty years ago not more than one-third of the people of England got animal food more than once a week. Consequently there was abundant room for a large increase in consumption without any approach to excess, and the increase has been almost exclusively amongst the poorer classes. Previously, the middle and upper classes got as much tea, sugar, coffee, and meat as they required, and they will use little or no more now. Can the same be said respecting the consumption of spirits, wine, and beer? Were not the people twenty years ago getting as much as, nay, a great deal more than, was good for them? That many would have liked more than they got is evident from the increased consumption now that the country is wealthier, but was there a single case then of a person who would have been better for a drop more liquor than he got; or is any one better—happier, healthier, morally or socially better—for liquor that they get now and which they did not get then? If not—and surely no one will answer these questions in the affirmative—is it not the purest nonsense to say that “it is probable that a large portion [of the increased expenditure] represents the moderate consumption by the temperate?” If enough intoxicating liquor was used then, a great deal more than enough is used now, and that extra use must therefore be intemperate use. At any rate, it cannot “represent the moderate consumption by the temperate.”

The experience of other countries as to the futility of attempting to repress intemperance by regulating the traffic in drink is the same as our own.

The Governor of Massachusetts, U.S., in a message to the Legislature, June 27th, 1874, said:

The earliest attempts to check the use of intoxicating liquors were in the direction of license and regulation. These attempts continued in the Commonwealth for more than 200 years, with a constantly increasing stringency which can only be explained on the ground that mild measures were found to be insufficient, until in 1855 the experiment was determined upon of adopting prohibition as the only logical and effective method of dealing with the matter.

If it were allowed that *theoretically* it is possible for intoxicating drinks to be used so carefully and moderately that the evils resulting would be comparatively innocuous, the fact would still

remain that no instance of such use by any community has yet been brought to light, and that it is universally admitted that *actually* the use of these drinks is the cause of an immense proportion of human misery and sin. It is marvellous that shrewd, sensible men cannot see that they are attempting what is practically impossible. To expect men to keep sober when places are licensed purposely to sell that which makes them drunken is surely the height of infatuation.

A consideration of some of the remedies relied on will now be advisable.

Speaking of intemperance at Bradford, November 14th, 1878, Mr. Forster, M.P., said :

The only real prevention for this evil was in the self-control and self-denial of the people. He was of opinion that nothing else would really stop drunkenness, and nothing else would stop any vice, yet no law could give a man this self-control and self-denial. But was there nothing which they—the neighbours of those who got too much drink—could do to help them ? He thought they might do something in persuading them to avoid temptation, in trying to cure themselves of drinking habits, in trying to give them habits which would preserve them from temptation, in striving as best they could to lead them from temptation and deliver them from evil.

But Mr. Forster overlooks the fact that intemperance is a physical as well as a moral evil. The liquor traffic differs from every other trade. The drink creates an appetite for itself. Unlike the ordinary articles that man swallows, the more he gets the more he wants, and the further he is from being satisfied. The argument based on morality may be fully endorsed by the drinker ; he may acknowledge its accuracy and force ; he may be anxious, he may determine to abstain, but if he has not the strength of will to pass a public-house—if his appetite for drink is so strong that he cannot resist the temptations the law permits to be placed in his way, such conviction of error, and anxiety to reform (the utmost that “persuasion” can accomplish) will avail him nothing. Persuasion may do much to check the ravages of intemperance ; the thoughts and habits of the people on drinking customs have been materially modified by it. The moral suasion phase of the temperance question has been a great success—a success which, when its humble origin, and the power and bitterness of the opposition it has had to encounter are borne in mind, appears marvellous. Yet intemperance is as rife as ever, and it is evident that, much as has been done, persuasion cannot complete the work. The proper course is to *remove the temptation* ; but that cannot be done by “persuasion.” There are in every country persons who are deaf to the appeals of reason and morality ; to acquire wealth or to

indulge sensual desires is the one object of their lives. To attain it they will sacrifice everything that should be most precious. Persuasion can do but little with such men. They will pursue their evil occupations in spite of the appeals and denunciations of Christendom. Until the strong arm of the law is brought to bear upon them they will continue to curse society and contaminate their fellows. This has been clear enough when other questions were at issue—notably in connection with brothels and gambling-hells. When it was found, a few years ago, that gambling-houses were bringing ruin and disgrace on the families of the wealthy classes, the places were very speedily suppressed by an Act specially passed for the purpose. And who would now think of objecting to such a measure on the ground that “no law could give a man self-control and self-denial,” and that the proper course to take with those who were being deluded and ruined was “to try to persuade them to avoid temptation?”

Much is hoped in some quarters from a reduction in the number of liquor shops, and attempts have been made to show that, other things being equal, intemperance prevails in proportion to the number of licensed houses. The arguments in such cases have always been based on the number of convictions for drunkenness. The practices of different benches of magistrates, and the plans adopted by superintendents of police vary so much in stringency, however, that in considering the drunkenness of any particular town as compared with another, little reliance can be placed upon the number of convictions for that offence. The peculiar circumstances of each town must also be understood, its area and the number of its police, and the size and description of the “licensed houses” allowed for. Doubtless the number of such houses, other things being equal, has considerable influence on the quantity of drink consumed; and if the number in any town could be reduced by one-half at a stroke, intemperance would be lessened. But it would still exist. The drunkenness previously originated and cultivated at the suppressed houses would be partially checked, but a great deal of it would concentrate at the remaining places. Beyond the benefit realised immediately on the reduction, nothing further would be gained. That is, *drunkenness would not continue to decrease*, unless there was also a continual decrease of public-houses. It would more probably gradually increase again, until in a few years the previous condition would obtain once more. The results of the experiment in Gothenburg point in this direction. The official returns give the number of cases of drunkenness as being reduced from 2070 in 1865 to 1320 in 1868 (the “Company” began the present Gothenburg system

October 1st, 1865). After that there was no further reduction, but a gradual advance, the number of cases

In 1872	being	1581
„ 1873	„	1827
„ 1874	„	2234
„ 1875	„	2490

In 1865 there was one case of drunkenness to every 22 of the population; in 1868 it fell to 1 in every 38; but in 1874 it rose to 1 in 26, and in 1875 to 1 in 24. In Gothenburg, with 70,000 inhabitants, there are only 41 public-houses—one to every 1700 persons—surely as few as possible if the people are to be conveniently supplied at all. Yet Mr. Chamberlain reports that the town is “over-supplied with liquor.”* The moral of this is that even partial prohibition does decrease intemperance, although it by no means removes it, and that the decrease is *only temporary, and extends only so far as prohibition is adopted.*

Any reduction short of prohibition is of small *permanent* value. So long as drink can be obtained in every thoroughfare it is of little importance at how many places in the street it is sold. Legislators must learn that the drink itself is bad, that it matters not when or how it is sold, that so long as it is drunk evil effects will be produced. The nature of alcoholic liquor does not alter with the place or the time of day; it will intoxicate at noon in the most respectable hotel quite as effectually as at midnight in the lowest beer-shop.

That the Gothenburg system is an improvement on the previous arrangements in force in Sweden respecting the sale of drink is possible; but it is not very evident from the information that has yet been placed before this country. That it would be an improvement on our present licensing system (especially if its laws were enforced), or on many proposed modifications of that system—modifications which are far more feasible, and far more likely to be adopted than such a costly and uncertain remedy as Mr. Chamberlain’s—is very improbable. Nevertheless the Lords’ Committee place the following at the head of their “summary of recommendations:”

That legislative facilities should be afforded for the local adoption of the Gothenburg and of Mr. Chamberlain’s schemes, or of some modification of them.†

The advantages claimed for these schemes are :

1. Control of the local authority over the issue of licenses.

* Speech before the Committee of the Birmingham Liberal Association, November 15th, 1876, p. 13.

† Report xlv.

2. A great diminution in number, and an improvement in convenience and management of public-houses.

3. As the managers would supply ordinary refreshments, and have no pecuniary interest in pushing the sale of intoxicating drinks, the places would gradually become like eating-houses and workmen's clubs—places of harmless resort.

4. Unadulterated liquors would be sold.

5. The elimination of the influence of publicans from civic elections.

6. A diminution in intemperance, crime, and disorder, and a considerable profit devoted to the relief of the rates.*

Upon which it may be remarked, first—That these schemes are not essential in order to obtain advantages 1, 2, and 4 ; they are not peculiar to them, and can be brought about without the adoption of either plan. Further, the evils of adulteration are enormously exaggerated. Nothing is ever put into the liquor so poisonous and injurious as the alcohol already there. The adulteration usually resorted to is watering, thus making it less deleterious. Point 3 is of little, if any, value. It is not for lack of facilities for obtaining ordinary refreshments that people take intoxicating liquors. This is frequently given as an excuse, but, like many others of the same genus, it is used for want of a better, and another would be found were it removed. The majority of the people who frequent public-houses go for the liquor and the company. It is not that they really require “refreshment.” Those who do not take intoxicating liquors require nothing either to eat or drink between meals ; they are not constantly in need of being “revived” or “refreshed.” If, however, being away from home, they require a meal, or a substitute for one, they have no difficulty in satisfying their wants, without drink, at any respectable restaurant, dining-room, or inn. If there is a demand for a species of “eating-houses and workmen's clubs—places of harmless resort,” there should be and would be no difficulty in supplying them, independent altogether of any cumbrous licensing scheme. The value placed upon the provisoes, “that no individual should derive any profit from the sale of intoxicating drinks,” is very fallacious. It is the seductive influence of the liquor itself, and the company that a man meets, far more than anything a manager or salesman can do, that induces him to continue drinking, and this would be the same under either of the new proposals. Advantage 5 would probably be counteracted by the development of new interests and influences. The sixth advantage claimed is very hypothetical, and, judging from the results at Gothenburg, already referred to, it is also highly improbable. Second, the objections

* Condensed from Report p. 24.

which the Committee mention as having been urged against the schemes would be almost insuperable.* The reply which they make to these objections, that

It would seem somewhat hard, when great communities are willing, at their own cost and hazard, to grapple with the difficulty and undertake their own purification, that the Legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to intrust them with the requisite powers,†

is amusingly inconsistent with their refusal to recommend the adoption of the Permissive Bill, the sole object of which is to provide that machinery and power which they here declare that "it would seem somewhat hard that the Legislature should refuse"—viz., the power "to undertake their own purification."

It has been thought—indeed, the opinion is still prevalent—that if greater facilities were afforded for obtaining lighter (*i.e.*, less intoxicating) liquors at low prices, people would drink them in place of spirits and stronger wines, and intemperance would thereby be diminished. The fallacy in this idea lies in overlooking the fact that alcohol, like all narcotics, must be taken in increasing quantities if the same effect is to be produced in the person of the taker, and consequently that a stronger liquor, or a larger quantity of the light one, is soon required; and further, that a small quantity of alcohol can create an appetite

* "Many objections, common to both schemes, and some peculiar to each of them, have been urged against them.

1. The objection felt by the extreme advocates of temperance to giving to town councils the conduct of a liquor traffic which they believe to be demoralising, and, therefore, wrong in itself.
2. The danger lest the temptation of profit might induce the town council unduly to increase the number and attractions of the drinking places.
3. The enormous preliminary expense necessarily attendant upon the acquisition of such a property; the absence of which expense not only facilitated the experiment in Sweden, but insured its profitable results.
4. The unfitness of town councils to conduct so vast a business with economy and care.
5. As regards the adoption of the Gothenburg system, the improbability that any company could be formed which would undertake to raise the necessary capital, and supply the administrative skill requisite to the conduct of such an enterprise in our great populous towns on purely philanthropic principles, and without the incentive of gain."—Report of Lords' Committee, p. 25.

The capital of the "Bolog," or company, at Gothenburg was only 11,000*l.*, of which 5700*l.* has been paid up. How much would be required to purchase all the licensed houses in any considerable town may be estimated by the reader. It would, of course, be an enormous sum.

† Report, p. 25.

for itself, and that almost every heavy drinker commenced by taking either wine or beer. Experience has also demonstrated the futility of this remedy. In the case of the Beersshops Act of 1830, and of the Wine and Spirits Acts of 1860 and 1861, the result was not only an increase in the consumption of the light liquors for which special arrangements were made, but also a very large increase in the consumption of spirits*—the direction in which there should have been a diminution, according to the arguments of the promoters of these measures.

The improvement of the dwellings and condition of the poor—making their homes clean, bright, and happy ; and the education of the working classes in order to give them better tastes, are the means which many consider best adapted to combat the evil. Professor Levi, Mr. Lowe, and Sir William Gull have hopes in this direction.

Generally for the decrease of intemperance we must trust more on the advance of education among the masses, on the improvement of the dwellings of the people, and on the concurrent action of religion and morals than on any legislative provision, however benevolently intended.—(Professor Levi, letter in *Daily Telegraph*, December 25, 1876.)

If the mind is diseased, it is to the mind that the remedy must be applied. We are not wholly wanting in this respect. By a general system of education we have, we may reasonably hope, offered an alternative to the public-house, which we may fairly expect that many will adopt, and increased civilization will react upon those who grew up with few opportunities of learning.—(Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P., *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1877.)

I think you cannot deal with drunkenness by legislation, but I think it can be done by the better instruction of the people, by providing better houses, better means of occupation, and better amusements, and fostering better public sentiment.—(Sir William Gull, evidence before Lords' Committee, Third Report, p. 256.)

The publicans themselves point this out as the direction in which we must look with hope.† Their advocacy of a remedy is,

* Comparing the ten years before the passing of the Beersshops Act of 1830 with the ten years after, the increase in the consumption of beer was twenty-eight per cent., while the increase in the consumption of spirits was thirty-two per cent.

† Educate the masses and open free libraries for those who are sufficiently educated to avail themselves of them. Next, let the homes of the poor be looked to : their wretched, insanitary, uninviting character, and the reason for a good deal of drunkenness will be found there. We venture to say that wherever the Artisans' Dwelling Act is put in force it will prove to be one of the very best pieces of temperance legislation ever enacted.—(Statement made by the Executive Council of the Licensed Victuallers' National Defence League to the House of Lords' Committee on Intemperance, Fourth Report, p. 525.)

however, far from being a recommendation. They may, with pious unction, declare their abhorrence of intemperance and their anxiety for its diminution, but so long as they continue to deal in that which causes it ; so long as they grow rich on the proceeds of a practice which is blasting bright hopes and breaking tender hearts ; so long as they can take the money which in numberless instances they know is required for, and which were it not for the facilities which they and others afford for obtaining drink would be spent in, providing the necessaries of life for helpless and starving wives and children ; so long as they remain in a trade which could not provide a living for one-half of those who are engaged in it if they did not regularly and continually supply drink to the intemperate, it would be hypocrisy to profess that their declaration begets feelings other than those of contempt and shame.

A word upon the improvement of dwellings. A most desirable thing ; many of them are bad enough. But why are they so, and who live in them ? They are occupied almost exclusively by intemperate people, and because they are intemperate. To rely upon better dwellings to make the people sober is to put the cart before the horse. *The people do not become intemperate because they live in such dwellings ; they will not live in them till they are intemperate.* Put them into perfectly new cottages, fitted with all ordinary sanitary appliances, and they will very soon bring them into the same condition as the wretched places from which you brought them. On the other hand, a sober family put into one of the other places will at once renovate it from top to bottom and make it cleanly and cheerful.

The Rev. S. D. Stubbs, Vicar of St. James's, Pentonville, London, referring to the evils of overcrowding, pointed out that, "if it were not for intemperance the people would not live in such circumstances. He had laboured in London for twenty years and he had never once come across a total abstainer remaining in such unhealthy conditions."* Better dwellings will never cure intemperance : it is prevalent in the most elaborately furnished mansions ; but temperance will necessitate and provide better dwellings.

Were the argument sound that it is through ignorance and lack of more intellectual methods of spending their time that people are led into drinking habits, the most highly-educated classes of society would be the most temperate, and those countries where there is the best and most general system of

* Social Science Congress, Health Department, October 29, 1878.

education would consume the least drink per head. Whereas, Professor Levi estimates that about one-third of the money expended on drink is spent by the "educated class." When we remember what a vast proportion of the people are outside that class it is obvious that the education of the upper classes does not prevent them drinking excessively. The biographies of some of the most distinguished literary and political geniuses of Britain and America present lamentable examples of the seductive influence of alcoholic liquors. Within the experience of most of us there are also cases that contradict the theory.* It has yet to be proved that the seats of learning and those who have the advantage of being trained there are remarkable for abstemiousness and sobriety. Scotland has long enjoyed a better system of education than any other part of the United Kingdom, and yet she is by no means the most temperate. Germany and Sweden are foremost on the Continent in educational matters, and yet there, as here, intemperance is a national vice of such increasing prevalence as to continually demand the serious attention of the legislature.

There may be less helpless drunkenness amongst the middle

* At Binghampton (U.S.) Inebriate Asylum, we are told that up to a certain date, 39 clergymen, 8 judges, 340 merchants, 226 physicians, and 240 gentlemen had made application for admission.

In the Report of the Convocation of Canterbury, a governor of a work-house states: "During the last few months I have had a lawyer from this town, the editor of a country newspaper, a professor of music and organist of the parish church (once a guardian), inmates of this house through drink."

Mrs. Wightman, of Shrewsbury, in her letter to the Bishop of Lichfield, April, 1863, said: "Gentlemen and ladies in different parts of the kingdom have applied to me for help on behalf of themselves or those dear to them. Thus, instances of drunkenness have come to my knowledge from the *educated classes* of society; facts I should not have believed unless coming from the parties themselves."

Mr. Walter, M.P., chief proprietor of the *Times*, said in a public address: "If I were called upon to name those within my knowledge who have ruined their prospects in life, who have lost good situations, and have fallen from comfortable ease and competence to a state of degradation, they would not be the men belonging to the labouring class following agricultural or mechanical pursuits, but they would be men of a superior class, of good education; men who have enjoyed comfortable homes and good salaries, and who, in spite of all, have fallen victims to that abominable and frightful vice."

Rev. R. M. Grier, Vicar of Rugeley, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee stated that he had established in his parish a house for inebriates of the upper classes, and that almost all who came to it were men of culture. He had admitted several clergymen, some gentlemen who had been in the army, and others who had nothing to do but live on their means; and he was constantly receiving applications for admissions. (Third Report, pp. 4, 5.)

and upper classes now than formerly, but there is no evidence to justify the opinion that there is less drinking. Less drink may be taken at a sitting, but it is resorted to more frequently and regularly throughout the day. Beastly intoxication is thus avoided, but equally senseless and more injurious "soaking" is substituted for it. In considering the classes amongst whom intemperance is most prevalent, sufficient allowance is seldom made for the fact that nothing reduces a man from the upper or middle to the lowest grades of society so rapidly and so effectually as drinking. Large numbers of the most degraded characters in our populous towns have once occupied respectable social positions, and in estimating the intemperance of the various grades, these should be debited to the grade from which they fell.

Further, if past experience is any guide, the probability is, that the country will become more intemperate as it becomes better educated, unless the facilities for drinking are decreased. Not that a person is more liable to drink because he is educated. But improved education leads to greater commercial prosperity, the spending power of the people increases; and facilities and temptations to drink being afforded, more drinking and drunkenness is the result. The present generation is better educated than the last, and yet it is more intemperate. The expenditure on intoxicating drinks was in

1841	£	78,000,000	or	£	s.	d.	per head.
1876		147,000,000	or	2	17	10	„ „
				4	9	0	„ „

In the five years ending 1845 the Government grants for education amounted to 185,000*l.*; for the five years ending 1875 they were 7,293,000*l.* In the same time our exports increased from an average of 54,000,000*l.* to 240,000,000*l.* a year. Yet in spite of this great improvement in education and material prosperity, combined with advanced wages and shortened hours of labour and important sanitary improvements, the following statistics show that the drunkenness, criminality, and lunacy of the country increased at a terrible rate:—

	Average per year for the five years ending	
	1845.	1875.
Criminal convictions (for the same crimes)	27,901 ...	54,787.
Poor and police rates	£6,217,007 ...	£10,770,355.
Death rate (per 1000)	21·8 ...	22·02.

There were no statistics of lunacy prior to 1852. For that year the number is given at 21,158; in 1875 it was 63,695—three times as many!

Mr. J. Chamberlain, in his speech in the House of Commons, March 13th, 1877, stated that during the fifteen previous years the total number of children in public schools had risen from

733,000 to 1,863,000. The following figures* indicate what was also going on :—

	1860.		1875.		Increase per cent.
Lunacy	38,058	...	63,695	...	67
Breaches of the peace and want of sureties. . . . }	9,154	...	21,302	...	132
Malicious and wilful damage of property . . }	14,877	...	23,181	...	56
Deserting or neglecting to support family . . . }	3,450	...	5,953	...	72
Having no visible means of subsistence }	3,090	...	5,507	...	78
Drunk and drunk and disorderly }	88,361	...	203,989	...	130 !!
Population	increased				18 !!

Evidently the gigantic demoralizing agency which is at the root of this evil has not only counteracted all the efforts that have hitherto been made to cope with it, but it has also very materially extended its own power at the same time. The extent to which this has been done may be partially gathered from the following facts :—Before the passing of the Beer Act of 1830 the number of licenses for the sale of intoxicating drinks in England and Wales was 50,442.

In 1849	it was	94,135
„ 1859	„	107,463
„ 1869	„	135,720

In 1829 the licenses were one to every 270 of the population, in 1869 one to every 149.

Education, so far as it goes, is a good thing, and does, and will, exert a powerful influence. Nevertheless, with these facts before us, we are compelled to agree with the *Quarterly Reviewer* that “if every one was able to read, write, and cipher it would not make a sound public opinion. Do men gather grapes of thorns? If the drunkenness of the day be not sufficient to raise up a public opinion against itself, neither the School Board nor the Church will ever do it. Does not every drunken wretch—a coward in the street, a braggart in the tap-room, a beater of women and a starver of children—tell us in plainer terms than pen could, that if we go and do likewise we shall become like him—not to be trusted for a word he says or a thing he does?” So long as alcohol possesses the power it does, it will tend to intoxicate those who take it, and create in them an appetite for itself—a craving for more. Education will not remove or prevent intemperance, because it can neither change man’s constitution nor alter the nature of the liquor. An appetite for drink is produced by its action on man’s phy-

* Vide Pamphlet by Wm. Hoyle on “The Influence of the Drinking Customs upon the Social and Physical Well-being of the People.”

sical nature, and no training of his mental powers, nothing that is instilled into his mind, can obviate that result.

III. The total prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is essential to success in grappling with the evils of the drinking system ; it would enable the nation to abolish intemperance, and obviate the injury it does.

Without making much direct reference to total prohibition, the report of the Lords' Committee deals with it with an ingenious appearance of fairness which is apt to be misleading. The heading under which it is discussed is "The Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill." In addition to the local and permissive features of that measure, objection is taken to the "prohibition of sale, but of sale only, of alcoholic liquors." As this objection, if there is any force in it, would apply to an imperial, quite as much as to a local measure, it must be dealt with. The answer to it is—If the prohibition of the sale only will accomplish what is required, why do more? If the use of drink to an extent which is a national injury is the result of, or inseparably connected with, its public sale, and the prohibition of such sale will effectually curtail the use, why go further? But if gentlemen who are so anxious that our legislation should be "on a logical basis" and "sound in principle" would have scruples removed by including in any prohibitory law a clause forbidding the possession, manufacture, and importation of alcoholic liquors, the supporters of the views advocated in this article would be the last to raise serious objection to the introduction of such a clause. No indication, however, is given that prohibition would be acceptable to the Committee did it include all that they think it logically should. On the contrary, its omission from their recommendations necessitates the conclusion that it would not. Why, they do not very clearly indicate.

The statement (referring to prohibition of sale only) that "The only justification for thus singling out the one act of sale from all those by which the liquor at last reaches the consumer would be that it is necessarily, or even generally, accompanied by such evils as to demand and justify its prohibition for the sake of the public welfare"* practically grants all that the prohibitionist requires as a foundation for his argument. It may be quite true that

There can be no doubt that the great majority of those who purchase and consume liquor are not guilty of intoxication ; nor are the places where it is sold by any means so universally the scenes of drunkenness and disorder as to call for their suppression on that ground alone,

* Report p. 20.

and yet, as these are not the grounds on which the demand for prohibition is based, it by no means follows that

It does not seem, therefore, either just or expedient that the purchase and moderate use of liquor by the majority of persons should be prevented because there are some who abuse it to their own hurt or that of others.

There are far greater evils connected with the sale of drink than disorder and intoxication in the house in which it is sold. The one great evil which the Committee in this argument appear to ignore is *the use of the drink*. If there was no sale there would practically be no use. The evils of the drinking system—the pauperism, the crime, the immorality, the waste, the insanity, the disease and the death, inseparable from it—spring from the use of the liquor and its use is fostered by and depends on its sale. The sale of drink is the key-piece of the puzzle; destroy it and the whole block will drop to pieces. This question of the prohibition of sale only, or of manufacture and importation also, is a mere matter of detail. No one who is in favour of totally prohibiting the sale of drink will object to the prohibition of its manufacture and importation. He may think the latter unnecessary, believing that the prohibition of one will put an end to the other, but he will never oppose it.

Some of the objections urged by the Lords' Committee against the Permissive Bill (which it must be borne in mind is quite distinct from an Imperial measure for total prohibition) are undoubtedly weighty and difficult to controvert, but they do not apply, and are not intended to apply, to Imperial prohibition.* The real point at issue between prohibitionists and the Committee seems to be—Are the evils of the drinking system so great and so inseparable from the sale of drink as to warrant and necessitate its prohibition? It has been the object of this Article to state reasons for answering that question in the affirmative.

It remains now to consider whether the proposed remedy would be efficacious if adopted.

* No friend of Prohibition will desire to refer to the United Kingdom Alliance, and the great work that it has done during the last twenty years, in terms other than those of admiration. Nevertheless, it would be foolish, because useless, to attempt to hide the fact that the feeling is growing amongst the staunchest friends of the principles declared at its inauguration that if its adoption and advocacy of the Permissive Bill was ever wise and politic, the time has now come when it should "hark back" to its original policy, and concentrate all its energies on an endeavour "to procure the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in all intoxicating liquors." The change made this year by Sir W. Lawson in bringing forward his resolution in place of the Permissive Bill was a change for the worse, and the extent to which the Alliance has identified itself with the effort is to be regretted.

In urging the objection that prohibition is impracticable—to which we have already adverted—the fact seems to be overlooked that the primary temptation to drink is the custom of society. People drink because others do. The difficulties that prohibition would place in the way of providing the drink and the disrepute into which drinking usages would fall on being practically condemned by law, would, in time, reverse public sentiment in reference to the respectability and hospitality now supposed to be connected with the provision and use of drink. As men have no natural appetite for drink,* they will not inconvenience themselves to obtain it until that appetite is formed; and as the appetite can only be created by the use of drink, when the temptations to, and facilities for, obtaining it were removed, it is very improbable that it ever would be formed. Temperance workers and others would *then* be able by means of “persuasion” to complete the work. Neither “persuasion” nor “prohibition” can alone rescue the people from the power of the drinking system. So long as the traffic exists, the facilities and temptations it offers and the customs it sustains will baffle the most strenuous efforts. On the other hand, so long as false ideas of the health-renovating and strength-restoring properties of the drink prevail, and men desire to use it, there will be unprincipled persons prepared to sell it in spite of the law, and the rigid enforcement of prohibition will be difficult. Not only must the people be convinced that the drink does harm to themselves and to the community, but the “Trade” must also be prohibited from supplying men with, and tempting them to use, that which is thus hurtful and mischievous.

When deliberately enacted in accordance with the will of the majority of the people, prohibition is practicable, and can be enforced with sufficient stringency to at once produce most marked and beneficial results. No better example of the contrast between the efficiency of regulation and prohibition can be offered than the experiments tried by the late Sir Titus Salt at Saltaire. He enforced total prohibition, and it was a great success. He then tried stringent regulation for a year. Great care was taken in selecting the houses and the men who should keep them : the sale was allowed for consumption off the premises only. Everything was done that could be to make the traffic moral and respectable, and to avoid drunkenness and profligacy. Yet the result was a miserable failure. So much so that at the end of the twelve months every public-house was closed, and the sale of drink forbidden. The former state of happiness, prosperity,

* Canon Ellison is quite in error in speaking of a desire for liquor as “a natural want” (Third Report, p. 107). A child of sober parents revolts at alcoholic liquor when offered it, and dislikes it when first induced to taste it.

and freedom from crime was soon realized, and prohibition was again a marked success. In Ireland there are two important examples of the effects of the absence of liquor shops. At Bessbrook, near Newry, where the factory of Mr. J. G. Richardson gives employment to from 3000 to 4000 hands, there is no licensed public-house, nor is there one in any of its surrounding lands. "There is no drunkenness in Bessbrook, no quarrelling, no crime, no police-station or prison, no pawnshop, no poor-house. *The operatives themselves have not two opinions on the desirability or not of having a public-house.*"

In the county Tyrone there is a district where no licensed house is allowed. Speaking at St. James's Hall, May 19th, 1870, the Rt. Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton (then M.P. for Tyrone) said :

There is a district in that county of 61 square miles, inhabited by nearly 10,000 people, having three great roads communicating with market towns, in which there are no public-houses, entirely owing to the self-action of the inhabitants. The result has been that whereas those high roads were in former times constant scenes of strife and drunkenness, necessitating the presence of a very considerable number of policemen to be located in the district, at present there is not a single policeman in that district, the poor-rates are half what they were before, and all the police and magistrates testify to the great absence of crime.

Referring to the village of White Coppice, near Chorley, Lancashire, before the House of Lords' Committee, Mr. A. E. Eccles said :

The first nine years I lived in the village we had no liquor shops, and then for seventeen years we had liquor shops, and for the last fifteen years we have been entirely without. Being young I recollect very little about the first period, but during the seventeen years we had beer shops in the village immorality was very common. I should say we had illegitimate children in every other house ; but during the last fifteen years we have had only two cases of illegitimacy, and we have had only one illegitimate child born in the village, and very little drunkenness. That is a very striking contrast to the time when we had two beer shops.*

It is to America, however, that all turn to see the actual results of prohibition. There license and prohibition have had full trial, and the results are highly satisfactory. After twenty-one years' experience, empty gaols, few policemen, happiness and prosperity are the chief characteristics of those districts that have enforced prohibition. The stories told about violations of the law by visitors to the States frequently demonstrate its

* House of Lords' Committee on Intemperance, Third Report, p. 69.

general efficiency. It does not say much for the intelligence or honesty of some of our public men who have visited these States, that they spent almost the whole of their time while there in stealing round back ways and through mysterious passages to attempt to break the laws of the people whose hospitality they were enjoying, and then that they blazon their success abroad as a proof that prohibition is a failure. Unquestionably in one or two States where some form of prohibition has been adopted in advance of the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of the large towns, or in opposition to the predilections of the authorities in those places, violations have been to some extent winked at, and the law has not been enforced with the stringency necessary to ensure universal compliance. Yet in the great majority of the towns, and throughout the country districts, the law being heartily supported by public opinion, has been strictly enforced. Even in these exceptional States the success of the law, taking the State as a whole, has been so marked that, notwithstanding the difficulty with one or two populous towns, it has been found almost impossible to make any alteration that would deprive the rest of the State of the power to prohibit.

Writing on April 24th, 1878, his Excellency the Governor of the State of Maine said :

The policy of prohibition was adopted here in 1851, and now there is no organized opposition to it in the State. After an experience of its results during more than a quarter of a century, it is acquiesced in by both political parties as beneficial to the people. The quantity of liquors smuggled into the State and sold surreptitiously is vastly less than was consumed in former years, and the law is executed easily and as well as any other of our criminal laws. I do not think the people of Maine would for any consideration go back to the old policy of license.

The City Marshal of Portland, Maine, writing at the same time, said :

Juries convict persons on trial for liquor selling, on proper testimony, as readily and promptly as for stealing or cheating, or any other crime. The law works with as little friction as any other on our Statute Books, and the more vigorously it is enforced the more satisfaction in it is expressed by the people.

Mr. James Henderson, the writer of the Article in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1877, on "The American Liquor Laws," said, in a letter to the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, Sept. 1, 1878 :

The scepticism which is displayed by many people with respect to the enforcement of the prohibitory law I confess I cannot understand, after the experience for several years of Maine and Vermont. It is

impossible for any unprejudiced person to visit these States without being satisfied that they have attained a large measure of success. The open sale of liquor in both may be said to be entirely suppressed. There is not a public-house to be seen throughout the length and breadth of either of them. Would the Licensed Victuallers' Defence Association regard a law as impracticable and inoperative which suppressed all the public-houses in the United Kingdom? Even in Portland, in which it is acknowledged it is most difficult to suppress the sale of liquor, you may walk the streets through and see no sign whatever of it. It is idle to compare the Maine Law with the laws of this country against theft and murder; but set it side by side with our own licensing laws, and I am inclined to think it would be found to be quite as rigidly enforced and quite as honestly observed.

The experience of the American States teaches that to ensure the success of prohibition three things are essential:—

1. That the law be enacted as the expression of the will of the majority of the people, and not by a political party, adopting the measure against its convictions, merely to secure the votes of an active and influential minority who make its acceptance a *sine quâ non* of their support.

2. That the penalty exacted for breach of the law be sufficient to deter men from incurring it—that is, that it be commensurate with the profit to be derived from illicit sale.*

3. That the authorities appointed to enforce the law do their duty.

These are not special conditions. They are essential to the success of any law which interferes with the habits of the people. There are on our own Statute Book laws which are comparatively inoperative for want of them, but of which no one ventures to advocate the repeal. If a law is to be written down a failure because there are violations of it, then the Ten Commandments are a failure, and every law is a failure, and ought by parity of reasoning to be repealed. The strenuous and unceasing efforts which those who are interested in the liquor trade make to obtain the repeal of prohibitory laws is the best proof that they consider that they impose an active and crippling restraint. The following extracts from letters by Mr. Hepworth Dixon are an indication of the kind of failure that obtains in many prohibitive districts in America. Writing from St. Johnsbury, Vermont, Mr. Dixon said:

No loafer hangs about the curbstones. Not a beggar can be seen.

* The profits on the sale of drink are so large, that to fulfil this condition the penalty must be very large. Mr. D. Lewis, in his evidence before the House of Lords' Committee, February 22, 1878, said that he had known keepers of shebeens in Scotland who had paid 300*l.*, 400*l.*, and in some cases as much as 500*l.* in penalties.

No drunkard reels along the streets. You find no dirty nooks, and smell no hidden filth. There seem to be no poor. I have not seen, in two days' wandering up and down, one child in rags, one woman looking like a slut. The men are all at work, the boys and girls at school. No policeman walks the street—on ordinary days there is nothing for a policeman to do. Six constables are enrolled for duty, but the men are all at work in the scale manufactories, and only don their uniform on special days to make a little show. . . . What are the secrets of this artisan's paradise? Why is the place so clean, the people so well-housed and fed? Why are the little folks so hale in face, so smart in person, and so neat in dress? All voices, I am bound to say, reply to me, that these unusual, yet desirable, conditions in a workmen's village, spring from a strict enforcement of the law prohibiting the sale of any species of intoxicating drink. . . . I find that these intelligent craftsmen are the warmest advocates of the prohibitive liquor law. They voted for it in the outset; they have voted for it ever since. Each year of trial makes them more fanatical in its favour.*

The Hon. W. Fox, ex-Prime Minister of New Zealand, speaking in London, July, 1875, after a tour through the United States, said of the New England States :

The effect [of prohibition] on their general condition is something marvellous. A total absence, externally at all events, of all those vices and crimes which you meet with amongst drinking populations, which is very agreeable and very surprising.

In 1873 the Parliament and Senate of Canada appointed a Select Committee to inquire into the working of the Maine Law and report upon the practicability and advisability of a prohibitory law for Canada. The Committee consisted of fifteen members—seven members of Parliament and eight senators. They visited Maine and investigated, and on the 9th of May, 1873, made the following report :—

Your Committee have also to report that they have made, as far as time would permit, inquiry into the operation and effect of the prohibitory liquor law in the State of Maine. Accepting its operation there as the fairest test of its success, we find that although there are violations of the law, in many cases flagrant and glaring, yet from the evidence received and subjoined to this report, your Committee is convinced that *a prohibitory liquor law would mitigate, if not entirely remove, the evils complained of.*

The right of the people through the Government to adopt prohibition is not only undeniable on the principles of sound government, but it is already granted in the position that the Legislature has always occupied in reference to the liquor traffic. For centuries the sale of drink has been restricted and

* *Manchester Courier and Liverpool Mercury*, Nov. 14th and 21st, 1874.

controlled, and this avowedly in the interest of the people. Once grant that the principle is a just one: grant that the traffic should be restricted as far as is necessary to insure the general well-being, and the right to totally suppress it, should it be deemed essential, is admitted. To enforce the closing of public-houses for a single hour is to curtail the liberty of the subject to that extent, and the only difference beyond that is one of degree. If the trade in drink be just and right, if it be one that conduces to the happiness and prosperity of mankind, and the well-being of society, it is a trade that no people and no law will be justified in limiting or repressing. But if it is a trade the influence of which is baneful and antagonistic to the object of good government, then the nation is called upon to restrict, and, if necessary, to prohibit it. If it were possible for a Government to effectually control or limit the liquor traffic it would have been done by some Power in some country. The evil it does is incalculable, and our only hope is in its annihilation. If the nation does not destroy it, it will destroy the nation.

THOMAS P. WHITTAKER.

ART. II.—ONE GENERATION OF A NORFOLK HOUSE.

One Generation of a Norfolk House: A Contribution to Elizabethan History. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D.
Norwich: Miller and Leavins. 1878. *Second Edition.*
London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

WE have seldom come across a more charming work than Dr. Jessopp's. It professes to be the history of the Walpoles in the reign of Elizabeth, when they possessed estates fifty miles in extent and were connected by marriage with the oldest families in England. The central figure is Henry Walpole, Jesuit, priest, and martyr, around whom stands a group of brothers, cousins, neighbours, all clinging to the old Faith and suffering more or less heroically for it. But the masterly historical sketch which illustrates the personal narrative brings before us the moral and social effects of the Protestant Reformation with a vividness and force which render it a truly valuable contribution to Elizabethan history. Dr. Jessopp writes in a manly and generous spirit. While he never fails in loyalty to the Church of which he is

a minister, he yet looks on the past with the eye of a true historian, and shrinks not from denouncing the crimes of those to whom he owes his present position and giving hearty sympathy to the sufferings and the heroic virtues of their victims.

We propose to make in the following pages a few remarks on the Introduction, which treats of the Reformation period before Elizabeth's accession; and then to notice the principal points in the history of the Elizabethan persecution, first in their political, and afterwards in their social aspect. We shall sometimes be obliged to differ from Dr. Jessopp. But as our criticisms will be limited to questions with which we, as Catholics, must naturally be more familiar than he can be, or which we view from the opposite side to his, they will not detract from our general appreciation of his book.

The spirit of the work appears plainly in the opening passage. Commenting on Mr. Froude's assertion, that on the death of Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole, "the reign of the Pope in England and the reign of terror closed together," Dr. Jessopp accepts the first part of the proposition, as a loyal Anglican can scarcely fail to do. But he adds, "Whether 'the reign of terror' ended is another question, the answer to which is not to be given hastily" (p. 1).^{*} The following pages tell us plainly that the true "reign of terror" only then began.

He proceeds to give a graphic picture of the social revolution which took place during the twenty years that closed with Mary's death:—"The overwhelming character of the revolution is even now difficult to realize, impossible adequately to describe; the shock which the moral sentiments of the nation experienced has never yet been duly appreciated; its effect upon the religious tone and habits of the people can hardly be exaggerated" (p. 3). Then follows a striking description of the disorganization of society in consequence of the spoliations in the reigns of Henry and Edward. One twentieth part of the best land changed hands, and was tossed about almost at random. Above six hundred religious houses, nearly three thousand chantries, collegiate churches and hospitals, and the incalculable treasures they contained, were given over to pillage. Thousands of men and women, hundreds of gentlemen by birth and education, were cast out homeless and strange, turned adrift to live as they could, and often reduced to actual want. Industry and commerce were paralysed by the spoliation of the guilds of which in Norfolk alone nine hundred and nine were plundered, and by the cessation of pilgrimages which had circulated countless sums through the

^{*} The references are to the First Edition.

country. As to the moral effects, parsonages were bestowed on menials, the curates were the scorn of their parishioners on account of their ignorance, and cathedrals and churches were the chosen area for fights, riots, blood-shedding, pigeon-shooting, and the housing of horses and mules as in "a stable or common inn."* "The ordinary restraints of religion had been suddenly and violently torn away; the clerical police was disarmed; the pulpits were silent." Education was stopped by the closing of all the best schools; "the universities" were "menaced," "learning and literature" were "smitten with palsy." But it was in the country districts, where gaunt stone walls crumbling to ruins or sumptuous mansions untenanted greeted the eye at every turn,—in "villages to which the abbey *was* the town" and in which the hospitality and openhandedness of the Abbot were missed, that "the tremendous magnitude of the social revolution" was hourly felt. There—

In the dark chimney corner during the long dull winter evenings, . . . many an old squire, still but a little past his prime, would tell of this or that prior or monk who used to drop in in the old days and bring some relief to the monotony of their isolated lives; he would not seldom mutter his curse upon the ribald recklessness of the parvenus who had ousted their betters and made the grand old places desolate. Sometimes, too, he would sigh for a priest of the old school, into whose practised ear he might pour out his soul and seek remission of sins that pressed sorely upon his burdened conscience. How bitterly he would mourn for the "good old times," and denounce the wild havoc that had been wrought (pp. 2—8).

Such was the social state of England when Mary came to the throne. Dr. Jessopp remarks with truth, that "as yet the doctrines of the Reformers had made very little impression indeed upon the religious convictions of the people of England."† He enters with his usual good feeling into the "one long dreary disappointment" of Mary's life, and into the irritation which might naturally have been excited by the cry of "bitter hostility" that came "from over the sea," from that dastardly band of preachers, who, "safe in their Swiss asylum," "shrieked at her in language which for brutal coarseness and venomous scurrility stands unparalleled in literature," and "goading one another on to the wildest phrenzy of hatred

* Proclamation of Edward VI. Cotton. MSS. Titus, B. ii. 39. Ap. Jessopp, p. 14.

† The Catholics had recently been said to be eleven-twelfths of the nation.—Lord Paget's Letter to the Protector. Strype, Eccles. Mem., vol. ii. part 2, p. 431. Ed. Clarendon Press, 1822.

and disappointed rage," exhausted "every resource of furious rhetoric" (p. 5).

But he does not do justice to the leniency of her rule, to her aversion from shedding blood, to her self-denying financial policy, and to the rare union of piety and prudence which she displayed in the restoration of the old religion. For though three days after her accession she set an example to her subjects by having Mass sung in the chapel of the Tower, yet she left it to the nation and Parliament to legislate on the question, and allowed above two years to elapse before she took steps, remarkable for their moderation, to make restitution for the scandalous pillage of the two preceding reigns. He moreover adds, "the unhappy Queen sought for comfort, vainly, in the dark and morose fanaticism of her French and Spanish directors, and the stern persecution took its course, which slander and malice and vituperation had done much to provoke, and which her own religious melancholy aggravated" (p. 5). Justice, however, requires us to say that Dr. Jessopp merely hands down the Protestant tradition on the authority of Dr. Lingard. At the same time he draws attention to the fact, which "has been passed over quite too lightly by Protestant writers—viz., that religious persecution was no novelty on the one side or the other, that the Reformers' hands were deeply-stained in the blood of the Anabaptists;" and he claims for Mary "whatever excuse may be found for the persecution by Elizabeth" (p. 6).

Honour is due to Dr. Lingard because it was he who inaugurated the scientific study of English history. But it ought to be borne in mind that he had not the access to public records which we enjoy, and, above all, that he did not write as the apologist of his religion, nor as a mere destructive wantonly upsetting whatever displeased him; but in the true scientific spirit he accepted all generally received traditions till he could prove them to be false.

Mary's history remains to be written from authentic records. Till this is done it is not a fit field for controversy. We trust that before long some competent Catholic will undertake the task. But meanwhile enough may be collected from Protestant writers, from Stow, Fuller, Wood, Burnett, Strype, Mackintosh, Maitland, Tytler, Strickland, and even Foxe, not only to support our estimate of her as a Queen, but to show that she was personally guiltless of the persecution, and that her clergy, whether English or foreign, were opposed to it.

The graphic description of the spirit of Elizabeth's reign, which closes the Introduction, may be taken as an answer to the question which opens it. After noticing the bitter dis-

appointment of the Catholics, when on Elizabeth's accession "their dreams of a restoration of the 'old order' were rudely dispelled," Dr. Jessopp says—"How the new Queen, with that mighty oligarchy of her council, tightened the curb, and plunged in the rowels, and laid on the lash with a heavier hand the more restive and furious the team became that she was breaking to submission,—will be illustrated, I trust, by the narrative in the following pages" (p. 9).

We now come to the second part of our task. Dr. Jessopp has brought out with great clearness the chief points of the persecution, by dividing it into four periods—viz., the first twelve years of Elizabeth's reign, the excommunication, the Jesuit, or more correctly the Seminarist invasion, and the closing years of her reign, each marked by penal laws of increasing severity. But he does not grasp the true character of Elizabeth's policy, or the extent of the persecution. He says that the refusal of the Catholics to take the oath acknowledging Elizabeth's *spiritual* supremacy "was taking offence at a word" (p. 57). He gives us to understand that Elizabeth began, or "perhaps had been driven . . . to a war of extermination" (p. 42) only after the excommunication. He asserts that "certainly when the penal laws were enacted, they were directed against the gentry almost exclusively" (*ibid.*), and that before the excommunication "it had been possible for 'good Catholics' to keep up some sort of conformity" (p. 55), or by paying a fine, which "could be paid without any great inconvenience, . . . to hold aloof from the Church services without experiencing any great pressure or suffering from much except the sense of vexation and annoyance" (p. 58). Every one of these propositions we positively deny.

Elizabeth's ruling passion was love of power. The word "spiritual," as applied to her supremacy, was not a mere word, but the assertion of the unlimited power which she intended to exercise. In virtue of this word her first public act was to require all her subjects to cut themselves off from the Church with which they and their forefathers had been in communion for well nigh a thousand years; and her second was to prohibit the worship through which an overwhelming majority of them looked for salvation, and to force on them another form of worship on her own sole authority. Dr. Jessopp says, with truth—"The Mass was felt to be and known to be the one great and precious mystery which every devout Catholic clung to with unspeakable awe and fervour, and to rob him of that was to rob him of the one thing on which his religious life depended" (p. 58). But not less precious were the Sacraments, which were the only ordinary

means through which he could hope to get forgiveness of his sins, and grace to live and to die as a good Christian. Had these statutes been obeyed, as Elizabeth of course intended they should be, the Catholic religion would have been extinct in England. Was not then the "war of extermination" waged from the very first year of her reign? Her subsequent penal laws went no further. Their aim was only to prevent the evasion, or to punish the infraction of these her first statutes.

It is evident that the early penal laws were not directed against the gentry almost exclusively. Husbandmen and artisans who were unable to pay the fines were "most cruelly and barbarously whipped in the open market-places." Others had "their ears cut off, others were burnt through the ear, and others of both sexes were contumeliously and slavishly abused."*

It was not "possible for 'good Catholics' to keep up some sort of conformity" without committing mortal sin—*i.e.*, ceasing to be "good Catholics." Immediately after the passing of the foregoing penal statutes, F. Darbyshire, nephew to Bonner, ex-Dean of St. Paul's, and later a Jesuit, was deputed by the English Catholics to ask permission of the Council of Trent to conform. The Fathers of the Council committed the question to a congregation of bishops and theologians, and in accordance with the conclusion arrived at by them, made answer to the English Catholics in the name of the Council that it was unlawful to be present at the new worship. One of the first acts of S. Pius V. was to send Dr. Sander and Dr. Harding to England to make his prohibition to be present at heretical worship generally known, with special faculties to absolve those who had fallen into schism.

Nor would Elizabeth have been satisfied by the payment of a fine. When she found that her intentions were defeated or evaded by the resignation of offices and benefices to avoid taking the oath, or by a mere formal appearance in church, she enacted more stringent laws. Catholics were now required to communicate in the Protestant Church; and as early as 1562, all Catholics, except peers, were made liable to be called on to take the oath, under pain of death if they refused it a second time.†

These penal laws were not a mere threat. All the priests who still remained in the kingdom were placed under surveillance within certain limits. The prisons were filled with

* "Dr. Allen's Answer to the Libel of English Justice," p. 174. Ap. Douay Diaries, Introduction by F. Knox, p. 81.

† Strype's "Annals," i. c. 26.

Catholics, both clergy and laity. Sir Edward and Lady Waldegrave and ten other persons were committed to the Tower for having said, or been present at Mass (p.178). Sir Edward died there on the 1st September, 1561; and Strype says of him, "His confinement here was thought to have been the cause of his death."* Strype also mentions the execution of a priest, William Blagrove, on the 10th May, 1566.†

As to the second period of the persecution, we agree with Dr. Jessopp that the excommunication was a critical point. On the one hand it was used by Elizabeth as a pretext for making death and vivisection the penalty for the performance of any act of Catholic worship, and on the other it clearly defined her spiritual relation towards Catholics. But we deny that "it was," as he says, "a blunder because it failed" (p. 41); and that the Papal advisers were ignorant "of the temper of the people" and "of the social and intellectual revolution that had been going on in England" (p. 56).

Protestants generally think that the object of the Bull was to excite a revolt of Catholics *en masse* against Elizabeth, and when this did not take place, they naturally suppose that it was a blunder and a failure. We purposely abstain from touching on the theological question. But we would draw attention to the historical fact that this was not the view taken at the time by Catholics in authority. The Bishop of Ross, Mary Stuart's chaplain, would naturally have been inclined towards the opinion most hostile to Elizabeth. But when the Earl of Southampton asked him for his opinion on the subject, he replied, "that there could be no difficulty; such Bulls must, before they could bind, be put in execution, and that depended on foreign princes, not on private individuals."‡ Ten years later Gregory XIII. confirmed this opinion in answer to the request of the Jesuits about to enter on the English mission, that he would remove all doubt on the subject.§

The Bull had, however, other important objects. It was in the first place a simple act of justice. Elizabeth at her coronation had deliberately and solemnly placed herself under the Church's jurisdiction. Her apostacy immediately after and her persecution of the religion which she had just sworn to maintain, could not be passed over without a dereliction of duty. Judgment was suspended while there was the faintest

* Strype's "Annals," i. c. 23.

† Ibid., c. 19.

‡ Murdin, 30, 40. Ap. Lingard, vol. viii. p. 58. Ed. 1841.

§ Catholicos tum demum obliget, quando publica ejusdem bullæ executio fieri potest. Facultates concessæ Rob. Personio et Edm. Campiano, 14 April, 1580. Ap. Ranke, Hist. Eng., vol. 1, i. 3, c. 4, p. 293.—Ed. Clarendon Press, 1875.

hope of a return to her duty ; but now it could be no longer deferred.

The Bull was also called for on behalf of her subjects. Dr. Jessopp describes forcibly the general temper of the nation with whom material interests were predominating over spiritual ; but he omits to notice the peculiar feature of its religious state. The nation had not lost its faith. An overwhelming majority was Catholic, not only in name, but with so deep and persistent a conviction, that after above a century of persecution the number of Catholics was still a cause of alarm to political and religious parties. And yet this Catholic nation allowed itself to be debarred from the practice of its religion and driven into schism and heretical communion. The fact is unparalleled in history, and the more we study it the more amazing does it seem. The explanation, however, is simple. Though the English Catholics loved their religion, they yet loved their wealth, their social position, their personal liberty and ease still more. This moral division crushed out their manliness, and made them cowardly and incapable of the firm union and resistance to which Elizabeth must have yielded.

When Dr. Allen was in England from 1562 to 1565 he found that—

Not only laymen, who believed the faith in their hearts and heard Mass at home when they could, frequented the schismatical churches and ceremonies (some even communicating in them), but many priests said Mass secretly and celebrated the heretical offices and supper in public. . . . This arose from the false persuasion that it was enough to hold the faith interiorly while obeying the Sovereign in externals, especially in singing psalms and parts of scripture in the vulgar tongue, a thing which seemed to them indifferent, and, in persons otherwise virtuous, worthy of toleration on account of the terrible rigour of the laws.

He was also obliged to demonstrate to them “the authority of the Church and Apostolic See,” and “that the truth was to be found nowhere else save with us Catholics.”*

The mission of Dr. Sander and Dr. Harding to England proves that S. Pius V. was aware of this state of things. Its necessary result must be the gradual dying out of the faith, as the event showed, and its corruption among the faithful. Some strong measure was imperatively called for. Dr. Allen had been blamed for “overmuch severity”† The Bull would make this impossible for the future. Elizabeth offered the Catholics the alternative of conformity or death. The Bull forced on them the higher choice between this world and

* Douay Diaries, Intro. p. 23.

† Ibid.

the next—between Hell and Heaven. Time has proved that far from being a blunder and a failure, it was an act of Apostolic wisdom and a great success. Though it increased the personal risk of the missionary and closed to him the hearts of the irreclaimably worldly, yet by stripping the circumstances of the time of their tinsel and placing them in their true supernatural light, it gave force to his words. It reclaimed the lapsed who dared not face the loss of their souls. It decided the choice of the weak and wavering, though true-hearted. Above all, it kindled the fervour which is the fruit of perfect self-surrender and taking up the Cross, and which alone could keep alive the faith. Five years after its publication, the Rev. Henry Shaw wrote to Dr. Allen:—"The number of Catholics increases so abundantly on all sides that he who almost alone holds the rudder of the State has privately admitted to one of his friends that for one staunch Catholic at the beginning of the reign there were now, he knew for certain, ten."* From this time began that heroic passive resistance of martyrs and confessors who preserved the faith for us by their blood and their sufferings.

The third period of the persecution, or the Seminarist invasion, began six years before the arrival of the Jesuits. In 1574 the first four priests from the English College at Douai landed. By 1580 when Persons and Campion arrived, a hundred had entered on the mission, of whom three had won their crowns; and already had been formed that noble band of Comforters, young "gentlemen of worship and honour" (p.89), who devoted themselves to guide, protect and support priests at the risk of their own lives. Up to the close of the century there were never more than sixteen Jesuits at any one time in England, and often not more than five or six; though in 1596, as F. Holt, S.J., reports, there were about three hundred seminary, and from forty to fifty Marian priests at work. Out of 125 martyr-priests during this reign only seven were Jesuits, a fact which, as F. Knox justly remarks, "is unintelligible except on the supposition that there were very few Fathers of the Society then in England.†

Elizabeth's response to the Seminarist and Jesuit invasion, was a statute which increased the fine for not going to church to 20*l.* per lunar month for each person, and gave one-third of the fine to the informer. Henceforth no Catholic was safe.

An army of spies and common informers were prowling about . . . living by their wits, and feeding partly upon the terrors of others and partly upon the letter of the law. . . . They were nothing better than

* Douay Diaries, Introd. p. 62.

† Ibid., p. 64-5.

bandits protected by the law let loose upon that portion of the community which might be harried and robbed with impunity. In some cases the pursuivants after arresting their victims and appropriating their money were content to let them alone . . . in others they kept them till a ransom might come from friends; in any case there was always the fun of half-scuttling a big house and living at free quarters during a search, and the chance of securing a handsome bribe in consideration of being left unmolested for the future (p. 63).

The poor Catholics, who could not possibly pay so heavy a fine, were given over to the tender mercies of these harpies, who were empowered "to levy *discretionary* sums" on them.*

The fourth period of the persecution, dating from the destruction of the Armada, has a distinctive character. Hitherto the difficulties of Elizabeth's position abroad and at home, though chiefly of her own creation, had furnished her with a pretext for persecuting the Catholics. But now not even a pretext could possibly be found. Abroad, her great foe had thrown his last card, and lost the game. At home, the Catholics had proved their inflexible loyalty in her hour of danger. Had there been a spark of generosity or common humanity in her nature she would now have allowed them the open practice of their religion. Even good policy recommended such a course. But she took an opposite view of the position. In her eyes the security of her throne only allowed freer scope for the gratification of her fierce passions. While her subjects gave vent to their joy at the destruction of the Armada by public festivities and thanksgivings, she celebrated her triumph by human sacrifices. Between August 28th and November 29th, 1588, twenty priests, ten laymen, and one woman were executed, solely for the practice of their religion, and without even a whisper of any act of disloyalty.† During the rest of her reign the rack and the gibbet were seldom long idle. The torturing of persons with no object except to find fresh victims to satiate her bloodthirstiness, occupied herself, her friends, and her ministers. A new statute in 1591, empowering her to seize two-thirds of the estates of recusants, gave full scope for the gratification of her avarice.

Dr. Jessopp's personal narrative deals chiefly with the two last periods of the persecution which, he remarks, Protestant historians "have slurred over so carelessly," or so "curiously ignored" (Preface, p. 1). It has a double interest, because he has taken pains to show "the significance of the incidents related, and their bearing upon the history of the time" (Ibid.). We will notice a few of the characters which represent the various phases of society.

* Lingard, viii. p. 297.

† Ibid., p. 290.

First stands the missionary priest, the true hero of the reign. One of Dr. Jessopp's most brilliant sketches is that of Campion, "the most brilliant scholar in the University" of Oxford,— "conspicuous for his extraordinary readiness in debate, and for oratorical powers of a very high order." Overcome for a moment, he took the oath of supremacy. But his conscience would not let him rest, and he quitted the University. The pursuivants were let loose upon him, but after one or two narrow escapes he succeeded in crossing to Calais in 1571. When after nine years' absence he was drawn back to his native land by the hope of winning the martyr's crown, his "enthusiasm of love and self-sacrifice" quickly spread to the hearts of his hearers, and awoke "such an outburst of Catholic fervour as England had not known for many a day" (pp. 83-88).

The picture of F. Gerard, too, is very fascinating—

On the other side of Grimston Heath, in the house of [young Edward Yelverton], it was whispered that a Jesuit priest was staying as a guest. He had come none knew whence, and they scarce knew how. . . . To be sure he could hold his own with the squire in the hunting field, or slip a hawk from his wrist with the best of them; take a hand at the card table, or enjoy a seemly joke with a frolic glee that made him welcome wherever he came; but what did that flash of the dark eyes mean when the ribald tongue broke out into blasphemy or filthy language? At times how grave he was and silent; with all this gaiety and vivacity, his mind was clearly always running upon serious things. Other men talked on matters of controversy as if such themes were matters outside of themselves, he spoke with a solemn earnestness that impressed his hearers most profoundly. . . . Certainly, he was living every hour of the day, holding his life in his hand, and sure, if detected, of being dragged away to horrible torture and death. And yet he went in and out as gay and fearless as the country squires, and as much at his ease as if there were no penal law upon the Statute Book (pp. 128, 130).

In 1594 he was flung into the Tower, where he suffered tortures worse than death. But no sooner did he escape in 1597 than he returned to his duty—

Comforting the persecuted, confessing the penitent, visiting the desolate . . . administering the sacraments, though to do so was, *ipso facto*, to incur the penalty of death . . . always cheerful, fearless, and unwearied; never swerving from the path which seemed to him a path that God had marked out for him; if under a delusion and in error, yet true to his convictions and consistent in his aims—an example so far, and a reproach to most of us who think our faith so much purer than his, while our lives can bear so much less to be tried and weighed in the balance (p. 123).

Generous expressions like that just quoted are by no means

rare in Dr. Jessopp's book. His testimony to the virtues of the missionary priests, coming from an Anglican clergyman addressing Protestant readers, is very valuable; and not the less so because he cannot fully appreciate their motives. He cannot enter into their supernatural love and courage. He fails to perceive that they fought for a spiritual object which Elizabeth's terrible array of spies, jailers, rack-masters, and executioners could not touch, and that the foe whom they combated was not the Queen, but the lukewarmness of worldly Catholics. Nor does it seem ever to cross his brain that they actually succeeded in "effecting the purpose" for which Dr. Allen founded his seminary, and the Jesuits took up the mission—namely, to keep the faith alive in England till "the good time" came, not, as they fondly hoped, in the next reign, but after the weary waiting of two centuries and a half. It is therefore only natural that he should "marvel at the childish credulity," the want of "craft, cunning, or sagacity," "the astonishing ignorance of the forces arrayed against them," and the "lack of the most essential agencies for effecting their purpose," which were displayed by "these Jesuit fathers and Seminary priests, whom historians delight to represent as the wariest and wiliest of conspirators" (pp. 159-60, 217). But however much Dr. Jessopp may fail to understand these holy men, yet he never fails to treat them with fairness and generosity. His loyalty to his own creed compels him to believe that they were "under a delusion and in error," yet he leaves to his readers the doubt as to "the error or the heroism, the weakness or the nobleness, the fervour or the infatuation of such lives" as theirs (p. 54). He reminds them that—

If we can afford to smile, as we well may, at their Quixotic venture . . . we can also afford to give them some little credit for the enthusiasm which animated them, and to regard with abhorrence the ruffians whose trade it was to hunt down such victims as these, and whose boast it was to torture and slay them (p. 217).

And again—

Think of them as we will, they had no mean personal motives: they had everything to lose, in most cases they had sacrificed everything; they had nothing to gain—nothing that worldly men would value or desire. There is only one way of explaining their vehement zeal, their reckless bravery, their dauntless persistence in the cause to which they pledged themselves. Give them the credit of earnestness, and allow that they were sincere, and the history of the world can furnish us with countless parallels of the same heroic devotion in a better or a worse cause; but assume them to have been mere politicians and selfish schemers—false, cunning, and hypocritical—and these Jesuit emissaries and missionary priests, who endured so

much and who fought their grim fight so stubbornly, present us with a problem which the experience of mankind will not help us to solve (p. 162).

The position of the young Walpoles, and the circumstances which determined their future career, represent to us another phase of English society at this time. Henry Walpole was studying at Gray's Inn when Campion was executed. He stood by the scaffold; and as the martyr's quarters were flung into the cauldron the blood spurted out upon him. His heart throbbed with a new emotion. . . . "It seemed that there had come to him a call from heaven to take up the work which had been so cruelly cut short. . . . From that moment his course was determined on, and from that day he resolved to devote himself to the cause for which Campion had died" (p. 91). Within six months he escaped from England, and went to the English College at Rheims, and thence to the Jesuits. His brother Richard soon followed him to Rheims, and after a time to the Jesuits. There were still four brothers at Amner Hall. There were also three cousins—Edward Walpole, heir of Herpley, Bernard Gardiner, and Richard Cornwallis, half-brothers, and both of them sons of Anna Walpole, of Herpley. These young men—

No future before them, and no career open, living under a ban. At any moment some emissary from the Government might knock rudely at the door; some pursuivant might come to call them to account, and press the oath upon them; some spy might report that they no longer put in an appearance at [their] parish church (p. 132). . . . It needed only a little exercise of ordinary prudence and a little worldly wisdom to secure to the Walpoles a position among the wealthiest families in the east of England; but, on the other hand, it required only a very little contumacy and a very little display of religious fanaticism to bring upon them the full force of the Government, which would not spare when there was so much to fall a prey to the spoiler (p. 112).

The young men met F. Gerard. Ere long all of them, except the eldest of the four brothers at Amner, escaped beyond sea. Thomas Walpole offered his sword to the King of Spain. All the others became priests, and the three Walpoles entered the Society. This family history is only what was then occurring in hundreds of households in England. It tells how the seminaries came to be so thronged, and what was the class of men who filled them.

Mr. Downes's history shows us another phase of English society in Elizabeth's reign. In 1561, he was sent to the Tower with Sir Edward Waldegrave. How long he remained there does not appear. In 1563 he succeeded to large estates in

Kent, Norfolk, Suffolk, and elsewhere. He took up his residence at Great Melton, built the hall, and lived in the style befitting his large fortune, till, in 1578, he was again imprisoned, as we shall hereafter narrate. For at least twenty years from this time he was a prisoner in Norwich Castle, allowed at intervals to go home to his wife and children, but liable to heavy exactions when his rents fell due, and restricted from going farther than five miles from his own hall. Each year he became more embarrassed. His Suffolk estate went first. His Kent property soon followed. At length, in 1602, he gave up his life-interest in his Melton estate for the "consideration" that he should retain the house, a few score acres of land round it, and the manor of Paunton, in Herefordshire, without being liable to any "annual rent" for his recusancy and absence from church. Dr. Jessopp says, "There is something very affecting in this man's history, and there must have been in his stubborn and immovable character some real magnanimity and heroism to submit without one moment's flinching to the wearing misery of thirty years of persecution and incessant spoliation, although by a single act of conformity he might have freed himself from all this ruinous weight of oppression" (p. 180). Yet "this man's history" was no more than that of hundreds of others of the best families in England. And "magnanimity and heroism" like his were handed down as an heirloom from generation to generation, not only of the Catholic gentry, but of families of lower degree, who now hold a high position in various branches of commerce and trade.

The history of Richard Topcliffe, a gentleman of high birth, and one of Elizabeth's intimate and trusted advisers, gives us a glimpse of the society at her Court.

He was of an old Lincolnshire family. He was the son and heir of Robert Topcliffe, of Somerly, and Margaret, daughter of Thomas Lord Borough. He married Joan, daughter of Sir Edward Willoughby, of Wollarton, co. Notts. He was born in 1532, and early came to the Court. After the Northern Rebellion he was a suitor for the lands of old Richard Norton, of Norton Conyers. Three years later he was in Burghley's pay, but in what capacity does not appear. He first came out as the "scourge and persecutor of Catholics" in 1578 (p. 63), when he seems to have already attained to the dignity of spy and informer.

In July of this year the Queen paid a visit to Cambridge, proposing to go to Long Melford in Suffolk, and to return by Cambridge, Hunts, Beds, and Bucks to Windsor. She suddenly changed her mind. The Catholics in the east were powerful, and the penal laws were not strictly enforced, as she was doubt-

less informed by Topcliffe, who was in her suite. So with her characteristic vigour she took on herself the office of High Sheriff. On the 10th August she was entertained very sumptuously at Euston Hall, near Thetford, by Mr. Edward Rookwood, who had lately come of age. The house was a small one; but the Queen had special reasons for preferring it to larger mansions in the neighbourhood. Topcliffe will describe the incidents of the visit—

This Rookewoode is a Papyste of kinde newly crept out of his layt wardeshipp. Her Ma^{ty.}, by some meanes I know not, was lodged at his house, Ewston, farre unmeet for her Highness, but fitter for the blacke garde: nevertheles (the gentelman brought into her Ma^{ty.}'s presence by lyke device) her excell^{t.} Ma^{ty.} gave to Rookewoode ordinary thanks for his badd house, and her fayre hand to kysse: after w^{ch} it was brayved at: But my Lo. Chamberlayn, noblye and gravely understandinge that Rookewoode was excommunicated for Papistrie, cawled him before him: demanded of him how he durst presume to attempt her reall presence, he, unfytt to accompany any Chrystyan person; forthewith sayd he was fytt for a payre of stocks: comanded him out of the Coort, and yet to attende her Counsell's pleasure; and at Norwyche he was comytted. And, to dissyffer the gent. to the full; a peyce of plaite being missed in the Coort, and searched for in his hay house, in the hay rycke such an immaydge of o^r Lady was ther fownd, as for greatnes, for gayness, and woorkemanshipp, I did never see a matche; and, after a sort of cuntree daunces ended, in her Ma^{ty.}'s sighte the idoll was sett behinde the people, who avoyded: She rather seemed a beast, raysed uppon a sudden from hell by conjewringe, than the picture for whome it had been so often and longe abused. Her Ma^{ty.} comanded it to the fyer, w^{ch} in her sight by the cuntrie folks was quickly done, to her content, and unspeakable joy of every one but some one or two who had sucked of the idoll's poysoned mylke (p. 72).

Edward Rookwood was utterly beggared by fines. He was in the Fleet Prison for debt in 1619. He died in 1634, aged 79.

On the 16th August the Queen dined with Mr. Townsend and his wife, Lady Style, at Braconash, six miles from Norwich. He had conformed, but he was under suspicion because his wife had not done so and his cousin was a recusant. He, however, escaped this time. But nine of his guests were imprisoned. A mile from Norwich Mr. Downes presented her a pair of gold spurs and some verses. But he was ordered to stand aside and was committed to prison, where he remained, as we have already told, twenty years. On the 19th August she suddenly resolved "to go a hunting" in Cossey Park, the property of Lady Jernegan (Jerningham). Her husband had been a recusant; but "it would have been too shameless" to arrest her now, because the Queen owed her crown to his loyalty at her brother's

death, and Mary had given him Cossey as a reward. So she and her son escaped, though only for the present. But three days later their cousin, Mr. Bedingfield, was imprisoned, together with such of the Norfolk gentry as had not "kept their church" (pp. 61-62).

Up to this time Topcliffe had been only a spy and informer. But the Statute of 1581 opened a new field to his ambition. He now applied himself to inventing devices for entrapping priests, and he soon became known as "the arch-priestcatcher,"* and "the most unrelenting persecutor of Catholics."† - We constantly meet with him in the prisons or on the scaffold, bullying and insulting prisoners, and revenging on them the failure of his attempts to shake their constancy by angrily cutting short their last prayers and hurrying on their vivisection.

When Elizabeth let loose her passions after her deliverance from the Armada, Topcliffe rose to the office of "torture master"‡ in which his genius had full scope. In 1591, we hear for the first time of what was afterwards called the "Topcliffe rack." His victim was Eustachius White, a seminary priest. After racking him several times in the usual way, he hung him up by his hands in iron manacles for eight hours, while the perspiration forced from him by the violence of the pain soaked all his clothes and ran down on the ground beneath him. But the only words he could extract from his victim were, "Lord, more pain, if Thou pleasest, and more patience." When Mr. White was taken down he said, with great sweetness, "Mr. Topcliffe, I am not angry with you for all this, but shall pray to God for your welfare and salvation." But Topcliffe answered angrily, "that he did not want the prayers of a traitor, and would have him hanged the next sessions." Mr. White replied, "Then I will pray for you, sir, at least at the foot of the gallows, for you have great need of prayers" (Challoner, No. 92).

Topcliffe so ingratiated himself into the Queen's intimacy and confidence that she corresponded directly with him. It happened that on the 26th January, 1592, the Bishop of London committed Anne, the daughter of Mr. Bellamy, of Uxenden Hall, Harrow, to the Gatehouse at Westminster as an obstinate recusant. She had hitherto been noted for piety and courage. But in this prison Topcliffe, by what terrors or violence we know not, within a few weeks overcame her virtue. He then removed her to lodgings in Holborn, where he kept her without money till he induced her, in order to pay her own expenses, to entice F. Southwell, S.J., to meet her at Uxenden. Topcliffe was "*with the Queen at Greenwich*"§ when he heard that F. Southwell

* Challoner, No. 90.

† "Jesuit Records," iii. p. 588.

‡ "Jesuit Records," iii. p. 589.

§ Ibid., i. p. 351.

was at Uxenden. But he rode off instantly, and following Anne's directions, captured him in the usual priest's hiding-place, and removed him to his own house at Westminster. The following day, June 22nd, he wrote to the Queen as follows:—

I have him here within my strong chamber in Westminster church-yard. I have made him assured for starting or hurting of himself by putting upon his arms a pair of (irons); and there, and so to keep him either from view or conference with any but Nicholas, the under keeper of the Gate house, and my boy; Nicholas being the man that caused me to take him. I send an examination of him faithfully taken, and of him foully and suspiciously answered, and for what? Knowing the nature and doings of the man, may it please your Majesty to see my simple opinion, constrained in duty to utter it. Upon this present taking of him, it is good forthwith to enforce him to answer truly and directly; and so to prove his answers true in haste; to the end that such as be deeply concerned in his treachery may not have time to start, or make shift to use any means in common prisons; either to stand upon or against the wall (which above all things exceedeth, and hurteth not) will give warning. But if your Highness' pleasure be to know any thing in his heart, to stand against the wall, his feet standing upon the ground, and his hands but as high as he can reach against the wall (like a trick at Trenchemarm), will enforce him to tell all; and the truth proved by the sequel. (1) The answer of him to the question of the Countess of Arundel. And (2) That of Father Parsons, deciphereth him. It may please your Majesty to consider, I never did take so weighty a man, if he be rightly considered. . . . And so humbly submitting myself to your Majesty's direction in this, or in any service with any hazard, I cease until I have your pleasure. Here at Westminster with my charge and ghostly father, this Monday the 22nd of June, 1592. Your Majesty's faithful servant,

RYC TOPCLIFFE. *

In answer to this letter the Lords of the Council gave Topcliffe permission to torture F. Southwell to any extent short of death. No particulars of his torturing were ever fully known, except that he was hung from the wall by his hands with a sharp circle of iron round each wrist and pressing on the artery, his legs bent backwards, and his heels tied to his thighs. He was subjected ten times to this torture, which, he said, was worse than so many deaths. On one occasion Topcliffe left him hanging while he went into the city. After seven hours he seemed to be dying. Topcliffe was sent for. He took him down gently and sprinkled him with water till he revived. But as soon as he had brought up a large quantity of blood he hung him up again as before.

* Strype's "Annals," vol. iv. No. 89.

Sometimes the Commissioners were present. They said that he seemed more like a stock than a man, for nothing could be got out of him. Robert Cecil was struck with admiration at his fortitude, which he compared to that of the Romans. He said that the Father bore this torture, which was much more painful than the rack, with a firm, and even cheerful mind, and would confess nothing except that he was a priest and Jesuit, and came to England to save souls. He added that Topcliffe allowed him no rest except when he seemed to be dying, when he would take him down and bring him to by remedies; but as soon as he was quite revived he hung him up again. All this time he was so patient and his countenance was so sweet, that the servant who watched him thought he was a saint. His only exclamations were, "My God and my all!" "God gave Himself to thee; give thyself to God!" "*Deus tibi Se, tu te Deo!*"

After about eleven days he was brought before the Queen's Bench and examined. Topcliffe having denied that he had inflicted any torture on him, he exclaimed "Thou torturer, what torments have I not endured, more inhuman than any rack or scaffold? These feet upon which I can scarcely stand, these hands torn by thy iron points, that blood which still wets thy pavement—tell the leniency of thy hospitality and of thy heart!" Then baring his arms, bloody, swollen, and livid, in a half-dead but earnest voice, he disclosed a series of the most brutal tortures. All eyes being fixed on Topcliffe, he cried out, "What I have done, I have done by authority, nor do I repent it," and he drew from his breast the Privy Council's warrant. Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, rejoined, "that the Jesuits were so wicked a race that it was both lawful and pious to make an example of them by inventing a new mode of torture." Thus encouraged, Topcliffe exclaimed, "That he would, if he were able, gather into one bundle all the Jesuits in the world, and consume the entire wicked race in the flames, and scatter their ashes to the winds."

The Council always had in their service some scapegoat to whose notorious cruelty anything that excited public indignation, might be attributed.* They therefore now went through the form of committing Topcliffe to prison for having exceeded his powers, though, as we have seen, they had themselves been present at the torturing. F. Southwell they removed to the Gatehouse. As he had no money he was confined with the pauper prisoners. Here he was so ill-treated,

* F. Gerard's Autobiography, p. 80, "Condition of Catholics under James I."

that when at the end of a month his father came to see him, he found him "covered with dirt, swarming with vermin, maggots crawling in his sores, his face bleared and like that of a corpse, and his bones almost protuding through his skin."* His father was so horrified at his condition that he wrote to the Queen, whose governess F. Southwell's mother had been,† begging that his son might be either put to death or treated like a gentleman. The Queen affected compassion for him and had him removed to the Tower. Here he remained, living at his father's expense, till he was taken to Newgate for his trial and his execution on the 20th February, 1595.‡

Topcliffe's imprisonment was a mere farce. His treatment of F. Southwell had secured him the confidence of the Queen and the Council, and within about a month he seems to have been granted a general "authority to torment priests in his own house in such sort as he shall think good.§ During the rest of Elizabeth's reign, the "Topcliffe rack" was generally used for torturing prisoners. An improvement on it was made by hanging up the victim by his thumbs instead of his wrists; but whether the honour of this invention is due to Topcliffe or to one of his numerous rivals in his fiendish profession, we cannot say.||

The sequel to the history of the Bellamy family throws further light on the character of this gentleman and courtier of the Elizabethan period. Anne Bellamy, when betraying F. Southwell, had stipulated that her family should not be molested. But as soon as Topcliffe had secured his prize he ignored the previous transaction. He pretended to be very angry with her for having dared to make an appointment with a priest, and removed her to the Gatehouse. On the 25th July he took her to Greenwich where he had her married to Nicholas Jones, his servant, after which he sent her to his own house in Lincolnshire, where about Christmas she gave birth to a child.¶

Meanwhile a warrant had been issued for the arrest of all the Bellamy family.** Mr. Bellamy being absent from home, escaped for a short time. Topcliffe's letter to the Lord Keeper tells us about the others—

It may please your lordship at my return out of the country this night, I did hear of Mrs. Bellamy's two daughters committed to the Gatehouse, but the old hen that hatched those chickens (the worst that ever was) is as yet at a lodging. Let her be sent to the prison there at

* "Jesuit Records," i. p. 358. † Ibid. p. 339. ‡ Ibid. pp. 349-379.

§ Bishop of Southwark's MSS. letter to Verstegan, dated 3rd August, 1592. Ap. Jessopp, p. 77.

|| "Jesuit Records," iv. p. 257. ¶ Ibid., i. p. 351. ** Ibid., p. 383.

the Gatehouse, and severed from her daughters, and her son Thomas Bellamy committed to St. Catherine's, and you shall hear proof cause enough, and see at work a strange example thereabouts. But Mr. Young, nor any other commissioner, must know that I do know thereof, or am a doer in this device: Nor by will other than his lordship that was with you when you did conclude what should be done at Greenwich last. Let them feel a day or so imprisonment, and then your lordship shall see me play the part of a true man with charity, in the end to the honour of the State. And so in haste at midnight this Friday. Your lordship's at commandment.—RYC TOPCLIFFE.

To the right honourable, my sin(gular good) lord, Sir John Pucker-ing, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England.*

Topcliffe got Mrs. Bellamy into his power, and by threats compelled her to conform, as appears by the following letter, in which he tried to employ her as a decoy to her husband—

Mrs. Bellamy, it may be that I did leave you in fear the other night for the cause that fell out in your house, better known to yourself than to any of us that were there. But because I myself found you carried a duty and reverence to my Sovereign Queen and yours, and showed the fruit of obedience you know wherein, I presumed to adventure to show you more favour than like offenders unto you have had showed in like cause. And your sons and your household for your sake, for I know her Majesty's pleasure is, and so hath always been my disposition, to make a difference of offenders and offences, and between those that owe duty and perform duty to her Majesty, and such as show malice unto her in word and deed. This day I have made her privy of your faithful doings which traitorous Papists will say is faithless. You seeming to bear by this your doing a good heart smitted with a little scrupulousness, her Majesty is disposed to take better than you have deserved and I trust will be your gracious lady at my humble suit, which you shall not want without bribe and with a good conscience of my part. And therefore take no care for yourself, and for your husband so as he come to me to say somewhat to him for his good, your children are like to receive more favour so as from henceforth they continue dutiful in heart and show. And although your daughter Anne have again fallen in some folly, there is no time past but she win favour. And knowing so much of her Majesty's mercy towards you as I would wish you to deserve more and more and no way to give cause to her Majesty to cool her mercy. And so I end at my lodging in Westminster churchyard, the 30th day of June, 1592.†

Mr. Bellamy was induced to conform and was left in peace for two years, when, having refused to settle some land on his daughter Anne and her husband Jones at Topcliffe's command,

* Harleian MSS. 6988, fol. 21. Ap. "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers," ii. p. 63.

† "P. R. O. Domestic Elizabeth," vol. ccxliii. n. 26. Ap. Ibid.

he was thrown into prison for having assisted priests. When he recovered his liberty he fled to Belgium, where he spent the rest of his life in extreme poverty.*

In July, 1594, we meet with Mrs. Bellamy once more under examination. She declared that she and her two sons went to church but not to communion. Her younger son, Thomas, however declared that he would now go to communion. But her two daughters and her uncle, William Page, held firmly to their religion.† The brief record of her examination among the State Papers of this reign reveals to us the terrible struggle that was destroying the happiness and the souls of thousands of families all over England.

On the 6th December, 1593 (p. 208), Henry Walpole landed in Bridlington Bay in the company of his soldier brother Thomas and Edward Lingen, who, having been driven out of England by the penal laws, had been living for a time as a buccaneer, but had now a longing for his native land. A spy who had been in the ship with them, informed against them, and before sunset of the following day they were arrested and imprisoned in York Castle. Thomas Walpole told at once all that he knew. But Henry and Lingen were obstinately silent. Henry had even the audacity to dispute the legality of his arrest, because the law touched only priests who had been three days in England without reporting themselves, whereas he had been only one day on shore when he was arrested. There was also a difficulty about the two laymen. For though they had borne arms under the Queen's enemies, they had committed their offences beyond the sea, and there was actually no law that could touch them. These legal quibbles were a stumbling-block to the terrible Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, whose conscience had not shrunk from pressing Margaret Clitheroe to death, nor from "those dreadful massacres," which for ten years "had been relentlessly kept up," and "the details of which," as Dr. Jessopp observes, "are more revolting and shameful than those who have not given their attention to the subject or read the accounts written down at the time, could be readily brought to believe" (p. 207). He wrote to the Council on the subject, and at the end of January Topcliffe came to his aid. Topcliffe's letter to the Lord Keeper tells us the result of his examination of the prisoners. After praising Thomas Walpole's candour he says:—"By this your Lordship may show unto her Sacred Majesty how God blessed her Highness with the uttering of that which I see will turn to her high

* "Hist. Prov. Angl. Soc. Jes.," l. 5. n. 25, p. 192. Ap. Ibid. p. 64.

† "P. R. O. Dom. Eliz.," vol. ccxlix. n. 31. Ap. Ibid., p. 65.

service for discovering of disloyal men and women both about London, in sundry counties in England, and deeply in Ireland." He then gives a list of trinkets, &c., from exiles to their friends at home, with which Henry Walpole had been entrusted, adding, "Much more lieth hid in these two lewd persons, the Jesuit and Lingen, which wit of man giveth occasion to be suspected that labour of man *without further authority and conference than his Lordship hath here, can never be digged out.* . . . So the Jesuit and Lingen must be dealt with in *some sharp sort above*, and more will burst out than yet, or otherwise, can be known, yet see I more in this service than ever I did in any before to her Majesty's benefit both of state and purse (p. 213). This last word reminds us that Henry Walpole was heir of Amner Hall, and that the Queen loved money scarcely less than she did blood.

Topcliffe's visit to York at this time was a short one. But his advice about "further authority" and "some sharp sort" of dealing with the prisoners, went not unheeded. He returned before long, and on the 25th February started with Henry Walpole for London. During their journey, which was a very hurried one, Topcliffe gave out that his prisoner was a notorious Jesuit who was privy to a plot to assassinate the Queen, and insults and outrages added to his sufferings at every step. On his arrival in London he was placed in solitary confinement in the Tower. Here he remained for two months with mouldy straw for his bed, and barely enough food to keep up life. When such hardships might be supposed to have quite broken his spirit and shaken his courage, he was brought for examination before Sir Edward Coke, Sergeant Drewe and Topcliffe. Torture does not seem to have been applied on this occasion. But at his second examination on the 3rd May, when only Drewe and Topcliffe were present, he was hung up by his hands in iron manacles. Again and again, on subsequent days, no less than fourteen times he was hung up. In July a letter to the Council was extracted from him, in which he gave information on many points. Dr. Jessopp calls this "a painful document; painful, *i.e.*, to those who would wish to find a man who had endured so much, exhibit more heroism than in this case can be claimed for him" (p. 236). But he himself refutes the charge of want of heroism when he says, "It would, however, be an injustice to Henry Walpole to allow my readers to suppose that, even at the very worst, he betrayed any who were not already heavily compromised. A careful reading of this elaborate confession shows plainly enough that he compromises no one *at home* whose life or liberty could have been put in peril by his revelations" (*ibid.*). We are surprised that Dr. Jessopp,

who with his usual generosity makes the fullest allowance for the possible effect of intense pain on a sensitive and nervous temperament, should not perceive that this cool calculation as to the effect of his words, this deliberate restriction of speech in the midst of excruciating tortures, was in reality the highest triumph of spirit over body, and therefore true heroism. In fact, we often find that such of these Catholic martyrs as were ignorant or distrusted themselves, avoided the risk of imprudent disclosures by preserving a dogged silence, while those who had more knowledge or more perfect self-command, could venture to make reserved and harmless disclosures like those of Henry Walpole, on the chance of their tormentors being satisfied with them. In such conduct there is no failure of heroism ; for our Lord, far from requiring us to suffer without an adequate motive, bids us avoid persecution when circumstances permit. To suffer for mere suffering's sake may emulate the proud fortitude of the Pagan Roman, or the defiant endurance of the North American Indian captive, but it lacks the love and humility which are the distinctive marks of Christian heroism.

Dr. Jessopp is also shocked that Henry Walpole should declare in this paper that having seen "the errors of his ways" he is ready "to recant and conform ;" that he "never allowed of the ambition of the popes or any their unjust usurpation over princes and their kingdoms ;" that he is ready "to go to the church," . . . and there "preach only such doctrine as his conscience doth tell him, and the Spirit of God, to be manifestly deduced out of the Word of God ;" and that "having conferred with divers learned Protestants of the clergy at York," he "did find much less difference than he thought." For such expressions Dr. Jessopp can offer or find no excuse ; and he confesses that "it is hard to get rid of the suspicion that his misery and terror had told upon him, and dragged him down to overact the craven's part." But we think that no excuse is needed for the general expression of his intention to reform his ways, or for the other ambiguous declarations which were evidently offered for his acceptance by the Council. Without reading "between the lines," as Dr. Jessopp believes to be necessary, no well-educated Catholic would "allow of the ambition of the popes or their unjust usurpation ;" because history tells him that they used for the good of Christendom, and without personal aims, the power which our Lord had given them, and their just claims to which all Christians up to that century had acknowledged. No Catholic priest ever preaches any doctrine except what "his conscience and the Spirit of God tell him are manifestly deduced out of the Word of God." As to the last

point, no Catholic would scruple to acknowledge that his exaggerated opinion of the difference between the Catholic faith and Protestant doctrine had been corrected by conference with Protestants, because he would know that such an admission would not touch on his faith; since heresy and schism do not depend in the least on their greater or less divergence from the true Church, but on the simple fact that there is a divergence.

But the studied ambiguity of these expressions evidently suggested to Henry Walpole the fear that his acceptance of this declaration would be used to beguile the ignorant and wavering by his example. He therefore wrote in words which could not possibly be distorted, that "whatever he was prepared to say or do, should be 'without prejudice of the Catholic faith, which I ever profess'" (p. 237).

He must have seen as plainly as Dr. Jessopp does, that such a claim would rob his so-called recantation of all value in the eyes of his torturers. To write it then after three months of agony, and with a certainty of the consequent renewal of torture, seems to us a really heroic act. How Dr. Jessopp can call these plain words "a quibble," and how he can suspect him who thus defied his torturers, of "overacting a craven's part," we are quite unable to conceive.

But whatever differences of opinion as to Henry Walpole's conduct may exist after the lapse of three centuries, his judges took the same view of that clause as Dr. Jessopp, and we agree in thinking that he himself must have foreseen. It drew on him far worse torture than he had yet endured.

The really dreadful ordeal was still to come. In July, 1594, he was able to write. It seems that in the next few months Topcliffe was allowed to deal with him as he pleased. What he endured in that terrible time, what he revealed and what he was pressed to invent, and what they tried to make him say or do or promise, will never be known. The curtain drops upon all these horrible scenes which make us shudder as we faintly endeavour to recal them to our minds. We do know that there came a time when he lost the use of his hands altogether; and when he somewhat recovered from the effects of his torturing, his writing had become a tremulous and almost illegible scrawl. For nine long months he lay in the Tower, and no further word or whisper concerning him has survived to our time (p. 238).

In the spring he was sent back to York. On the 13th April he was tried, and on the 17th he was hanged, cut up while still alive, and quartered. The day before his execution he wrote to F. Holtby, S.J.—

I tell you nothing of all that passed during my year's detention in the Tower of London. I hold my peace, too, on many other details.

You will know them in heaven when we shall see each other again. . . . It is time for me to lay my pen aside to employ myself in prayer to the great God, for whom I am fighting the good fight, to whom I hope to be face to face to-morrow (p. 252).

Is it thus that one who was conscious of having fallen from the faith would refer to the circumstances of his fall on the eve of seeing "the great God . . . face to face?" Nay, is it not rather the first note of the triumphal song of him who knows that he has "kept the faith," and that "there is laid up for [him] a crown of justice which the Lord, the just judge, will render to him" on the morrow? (2 Tim. c. iv. v. 7).

Yet another case of almost incredible immorality must be noticed. In November, 1594, Topcliffe sued Thomas Fitzherbert for 5000*l.*, promised to him if he would persecute Fitzherbert's father and uncle to death, and also Mr. Bassett. Fitzherbert pleaded that the conditions had not been fulfilled, as his father and uncle had died naturally and Bassett was prospering. But Bassett proved that treacherous devices had been employed by Topcliffe to entrap him, and Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, bore witness openly how he had sought to inform him against the parties "contrary to all equity and conscience." The case was too shameful for even those bad times, and "was put over for secret hearing." Topcliffe stuck to his claim, but losing his temper he used expressions that reflected on the Lord Keeper and some members of the Privy Council. Whereupon he was committed to the Marshalsea "*for contempt*," but no notice seems to have been taken of the peculiar circumstances of his claim. He wrote from his prison two letters to the Queen, of which Dr. Jessopp says — "Two more detestable compositions it would be difficult to find." In one of them dated "Good or evil Friday," he says —

I have helpt more traitors (to Tyburn) than all the noblemen and gentlemen of the Court, your counsellors excepted. And now by this disgrace I am in fair way and made apt to adventure my life every night to murderers, for since I was committed, wine in Westminster hath been given for joy of that news. In all prison rejoicings; *and it is like that the fresh dead bones of Father Southwell at Tyburn and Father Walpole at York, executed both since Shrovetide, will dance for joy.**

One who was on terms of such familiar intimacy with his Sovereign and could do such good service had reason to expect a speedy release. "The scoundrel was out of prison again and at his old tricks in October, the restless ferocity of the man never allowing his persecuting mania to cease for an hour" (p. 64).

* Harleian MSS. us. p. 185. Ap. Jessopp, p. 64.

It would be a mistake to look on Topcliffe merely as a "monster" whose cruelties "would be absolutely incredible were it not that the evidence of even his own admission is too strong to be controverted" (p. 63). The true significance of his history is that he was only one of a numerous profession composed of "bandits protected by law" (*ibid.*), to which flocked gentlemen of birth and position, which won for its members wealth and Court favour, and in the highest department of which the Queen and her ministers personally took part. The lion's share of the heavy fine for not going to church fell to the pursuivants and informers, the third due to the poor remaining unpaid (p. 106). Topcliffe, whose surpassing villany and ferocity had placed him at the head of his profession, enjoyed the Queen's intimacy and confidence. Young, second to him alone in atrocity and the inventor of the instrument of torture called "Young's fiddle," was made Justice of the Peace; while Wade, who tortured Nicholas Owen, the Jesuit lay-brother, to death under circumstances of preternatural barbarity, was selected to be Secretary of the Council, and rose to be Governor of the Tower. The Queen's ministers and law officers assisted at the hideous mysteries of the torture-chamber; and as torture was forbidden by the law of the land, each case of its infliction was her direct act, by virtue of the prerogative of dispensing with the laws which she claimed.

This almost incredible demoralization of the highest classes unavoidably spread to the lower orders, whom they employed as assistants and who had their due share of the spoil. It was a strange Nemesis of the penal laws which fostered and developed it. But it may be traced back to "the shock which the moral sentiment" and "the religious tone and habits" of the nation experienced through the sudden and violent tearing away of "the ordinary restraints of religion" by "the utter break up of the ancient ecclesiastical institutions of the kingdom" (p. 3). It is a striking commentary on Dr. Jessopp's sketch of the overwhelming revolution which ushered in Elizabeth's reign. No more direct answer could possibly be given to his opening question—"Whether the reign of terror ended with the death of Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole?"

ART. III.—ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS.

1. Origenis *Contra Celsum*, Libri I., II., III., IV. Recensvit et cym delectv notarvm edidit Wilhelmus Selwyn, S.T.P., Regiæ majestati a sacris, Dominæ Margaretæ in sacra Theologia Lector, Coll. Div. Joann. olim Socio. Cantabrigiæ: Deighton, Bell et Soc. Londini: Bell et Filii. 1876.
2. Origenis *Contra Celsum Libri octo. Ejusdem Philocalia.* Gulielmus Spencerus, Cantabrigiensis, Coll. Trin. Soc. utriusque operis versionem recognovit, et Annotationes adjecit. Cantabrigiæ. 1658.

THE value of one of the great documents of history which have descended to us from remote times may be measured by the regret we should feel if it were missing, or by the curiosity there would be shown if it could be announced as a discovery, as a treasure rescued from a papyrus-roll or a palimpsest. The works of the early Christian apologists, and particularly the treatise of Origen against Celsus, one of the most voluminous and interesting among them, are examples of this remark, as throwing so vivid a light on the most stupendous revolution that ever happened in the world: a revolution still operating, and to close only with the duration of time, but of the history of which in its earlier stages fragments only remain. It is not the object of the present article to give a *résumé* of the modern researches connected with the celebrated treatise we have named, but rather to review the work itself, as if it had first fallen into our hands, and to give the unlearned reader some idea of the importance of its contents, which, in ecclesiastical histories, even the more elaborate, are scarcely summarised in the detail which they deserve.

The work which Origen answers in the eight books of the *Contra Celsum* was a studied and copious argument against the Christian religion, composed under the ambitious title of *Lógos Alethés*, or "True Discourse," by Celsus, a philosopher whom Origen often charges with being an Epicurean, but who, from various passages quoted from his work, would seem to have inclined to Platonism, or at least to have borrowed from Platonism and from Stoicism as well, in the superficial manner common to brilliant writers, who are ready to pick up a weapon wherever they find it. This Celsus (there was an earlier one in Nero's time) lived in the period of the Antonines (say about

A.D. 140), and was therefore distant from the dawn of Christianity by about the length of time that separates us from the reign of George II. He seems to have been acquainted with Christianity, not from sources that could give him any real idea of it, but from its external aspect as viewed by a world that feared and hated it, and despised it too, so far as contempt is consistent with those other feelings; further, from the reading of the Scriptures "without note or comment," as the Alexandrine literati had them to refer to in the version of the LXX.; and we know what strange ideas externs and "laymen" outside of any art and profession may derive from turning over documentary evidence without any traditionary voice to explain it. He has poured into his "True Discourse" whatever notions he had gathered from whatever quarter, and we have in it, or at least in the faithful extracts supplied by Origen, the table-talk against Christianity that might have been heard at Greek and Roman banquets, the discussions of the lecture-rooms or the porticoes, and the eager objections also which had made their way from the schools of the Rabbis to those of the philosophers. At best, it was a sterile and inefficient assault, the memory of which is preserved only in the answer to it; just as in the world of literature, we should never have heard of Boyle but for Bentley. Yet in an age when the rusty weapons of infidelity are refurbishing up, and being re-hung in its armoury, it may be instructive to observe how they flashed in the arena sixteen centuries ago, and were foiled as they will be again; not to mention that the combat is in itself interesting, as part of the history of the Church, in which false doctrines—pagan, or heretical, or infidel—hold the place that hostilities and rebellions do in that of the world.

In attempting, then, a review of this treatise, we shall take the objections of Celsus, and their refutation by Origen, in the following order:—(1) The secrecy ascribed to Christianity as a society, and (2) as a dogma; (3) the principle of faith (and here we shall exhibit the great leading evidences alleged by Origen); (4) attacks on Christianity as originating in "faction;" (5) attacks on its supposed divisions; (6) the notion of its not essentially differing from beliefs previously held; (7) the question of altars and images in the controversy, and of the *cultus* of angels; (8) ascription of our Lord's miracles to magic; (9) parallelism from classical legends and Egyptian ritual; (10) moral superiority of the Christian Church; (11) insulting comparisons instituted by Celsus; (12) their connection with Platonic theories; (13) objections to the great facts of revelation; (14) Origen's character as a controversialist.

I. In the very front of the hostile array of Celsus stands the

well-known charge, that the Christians form secret covenants with each other, contrary to the law, and, which is another branch of the same accusation, that "the dogma" is secret. The world at large, though probably few great houses were without inhabitants who acknowledged themselves Christians, seems to have had as vague impressions of what Christianity really meant as ordinary Europeans of the present day distant from Russia have of the signification of "Nihilism." In another part of his treatise Celsus had urged the same objection in a more concrete form, and in combination with other grounds of dislike. In the very curious passage to which we refer,* he talked of the underhand ways of the Christian teachers, describing them as people of a low class, workers in wool, shoemakers, fullers, and such-like, who in private houses get influence over the young and set them against their parents, filling their minds with wild ideas about the happiness which would be the consequence of accepting their doctrines; silent in the presence of superior persons, but enticing their thoughtless auditors to follow them into the women's apartments, or the shoemaker's shop, or the laundry, where they could preach without fear of interruption. To understand this, it should be remarked that in the houses of the great most of the trades necessary for domestic life were carried on by slaves on the premises of their masters. There might be hundreds of slaves in one residence, and parts of the house would of course be set aside for their occupation. Christianity at first, as we know from Scripture, could return few of the rich or noble among its adherents. St. Paul himself earned his bread as a tent-maker. Many of the converts were slaves, and such were found even in the imperial palace. This great fact of slavery coloured the whole of social life, and the most superficial reader must be struck by the extreme frequency with which servitude of various kinds is alluded to in the parables of our Lord. A religion which adapted itself so tenderly to suffering of all sorts, and which especially sympathised with that of servitude, which it ennobled and exalted, could not but be eagerly caught up by this vast and lowest stratum of mankind; and its "dogma" would be "secret," not necessarily because anything in it was held in reserve, but simply from the want of communication between the lordly and the servile class, and the incapacity and disinclination of the former to enter into anything which interested the latter. Against Celsus' objection that the Christians form illegal covenants with each other, the Christian apologist justifies such covenants by comparing them with the associations formed by civilised people who find them-

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 144, ed. Spencer.

selves dwelling among barbarous nations like the Scythians, where laws prevail that are contrary to right; and does not hesitate further to defend the Christian combinations by the parallel of secret societies, formed where tyrants overturn the covenants which lie at the foundation of States. Such societies presented an analogy to the case of bonds and covenants made to resist the laws of the devil's tyranny, and for the salvation of all who can be persuaded to revolt from him, as from the laws of barbarians or unholy despots.

II. All this quite establishes the general aspect of secrecy which the pagans imagined they saw in this action of the Kingdom of God which was forming among them. To what extent, however, was it really secret, either as an organisation or a dogma? Origen certainly in one clear passage denies that the dogma, by which of course is meant Christian doctrine in general, could fairly be called secret, unless indeed, as the logicians would say, *per accidens*. He remarks as follows:—

Next, as he (Celsus) often calls the dogma "secret," in this, too, we must refute him, nearly all the world being better acquainted with the preaching of the Christians than it is with the opinions of the philosophers; for who is ignorant of the birth of Christ from a Virgin; and of the Crucified, and of His Resurrection, which is believed among many, and of the judgment which is proclaimed, chastising the sinners according to their deserts, and rewarding the just? nay, even the mystery of the Resurrection being known, is talked of, though laughed at by the infidels. It is quite absurd to say that in these points the doctrine is secret; but that there are some things that follow them which *are* esoteric, and do not get out among the multitude, is not peculiar to the Word of the Christians alone, but belongs also to the philosophers, among whom there were some discourses exoteric and others esoteric.—*Contra Celsum*, i. p. 7.

The study of this treatise on the whole would lead us to the conclusion that Origen, in speaking of the esoteric doctrines of Christianity, had in view not so much a *disciplina arcani*, as the phrase is commonly understood—that is, a discipline keeping in reserve certain doctrines forming part of the body of traditions, but which were not to be generally communicated, as interpretations of the more mysterious passages of Scripture, prophecies, parables, recondite and abstruse ideas only to be judged of by deep theological students. He does, however, describe a graduated system of Christian doctrine in the case of catechumens; and the reserve he shows on the subject of the Holy Eucharist is very remarkable.*

* See particularly *Contra Celsum*, viii. p. 416, ed. Spencer:—ἔστι δὲ καὶ σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος εὐχαριστίας καλούμενος.

III. There is no charge urged by Celsus that appears to touch his great antagonist so to the quick as that in which he ascribes to Christianity the principle of unreasoning faith and a partiality to ignorance, none which he takes more trouble to answer or to explain. Celsus urges this objection as emphatically as any infidel or Protestant, and precisely in their sense.

It is worth while to quote his words. He says—

Some desire neither to render nor to accept a reason for what they believe, using the maxim, "Examine not, but believe," and "Thy faith will save thee." [They say] "Believe that He to whom I am introducing thee is the Son of God, though He was bound in the most degrading manner, or most shamefully punished, though knocked about, but as yesterday, in the eyes of all men, most outrageously. For that reason, believe it all the more." Some of them bring in one guide, others another; but common and ready to the hand of all of them is the saying, "Believe, if thou wilt be saved, or go thy way." What shall those do who really wish to be saved? Shall they fling up dice and divine whither they are to turn, or whom they are to join?—*Contra Celsum*, vi. p. 282.

Origen answers this objection with great fulness and force, though with an unnecessary concession to the false principle which underlies it. He begins by admitting that if it was possible for mankind generally to devote their time to philosophising, that would be the best method to adopt, and that the more recondite aspects of the Christian revelation would afford plenty of scope for it; but that, as very few have the leisure required for such pursuits, what better means could have been devised under such a state of things than to subdue men's minds by faith in the divine system of rewards and punishments, without waiting for the tardy examination of reason? Faith, he contends, following the principle of analogy, is what holds society together. Men marry, they bring up families, they undertake long voyages, they sow the earth, in the confidence, often far from resting on grounds that could of themselves produce certainty, that these great steps will turn out favourably. And in the field of speculation even, something of the same kind might be observed. The schools of philosophy, one or other of which every educated Greek or Roman of that day took as the guide of life, appealed, indeed, to reason to prove their conclusions; but what led each thinker, at the outset of life, to close with one or other, to announce himself as Academic, or Peripatetic, or Stoic, or Epicurean? Grounds that would seem very partial and imperfect, compared with the elaborate theories to which these schools would introduce him. The accident of locality, perhaps,

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 10.

or an inclination which the learner never thought of analysing, would determine his first but all-important step. If one is satisfied thus to close with the leader of a sect, how much rather with God, and with Him who teaches that He alone is to be worshipped? It is a favourite argument with Origen to point to the actual results which witnessed to the efficiency of this instrument in working a change among mankind. Was it *better* that the great multitude of believers who had emerged out of the deluge of vice in which they once wallowed should have their characters subdued by unreasoning faith in the punishments and the rewards which are held out to sin and to well-doing, or not to close with the truth till they could give themselves up to a rational investigation? A thoughtful mind would not think that the success of a physician in restoring many sick people to health was obtained without the Divine favour; such a blessing did not happen ἀθεῖ—how much more the success of Him who healed and converted and bettered the souls of many, and made them depend upon Almighty God, and taught them to refer every action to His pleasure, and to avoid everything, down to the smallest word or thought or deed that was displeasing to Him? He speaks from his own experience as a religious teacher of the utility of this principle, and acknowledges that he had taught many to believe, independently of reasoning, who were not able to relinquish their practical pursuits, and devote themselves, as we should say, to controversy. The following passage is remarkable:—

Though Celsus and his Jew may laugh to scorn what I am going to say, still it shall be said. Many, *as though against their will*, have come to Christianity, some spirit of a sudden turning the governing principle of their minds, with an overwhelming force, from hatred of the Word to a readiness to die for it, and having appeared to them in vision or in dream; for we have known many such instances; which if we write, we ourselves having been present, and witnesses of them, we shall be met with loud laughter on the part of the infidels, who imagine that, like those whom they suppose to have invented these things, we too forge them.—*Contra Celsum*, i. p. 35.

So far, then, we have, as evidences upon which Origen relied, the great patent fact of Christianity, which had spread over the earth and was found in all lands, almost before men were aware of its existence; and, secondly, the great and wonderful change it had wrought in the minds of those who had accepted it, producing a marked character, powerfully in contrast with that which reigned in the world previously. This character was gentle, subdued, humble, pure, qualities but faintly anticipated in the philosophy of Paganism, yet brought out with ease, and on a scale and extent hitherto unknown. Another important branch

of the great apologetic system which Origen had in his mind, was the fact of the persecutions which had been sustained by the first and later Christians in spreading the faith through the world. This is the fragment of Origen's argument out of which Paley has formed the very foundation of his treatise on the "Evidences of Christianity," just as another fragment contains the nucleus of Butler's "Analogy of Religion." The former is summarised in the following words :—" [The disciples] displayed the sincerity of their feelings towards Jesus by enduring anything whatsoever because of His words. Such endurance and resolution even unto death they took up, with a disposition of mind that did not forge lies concerning their Master; and, to fair-minded persons, a very clear proof of their having been persuaded of the truth of what they wrote, is that they endured so many and such great sufferings for the sake of Him whom they believed to be the Son of God" (ii. p. 65). It will be perceived from the tone of this passage that persecution was not, at the time when it was written, the condition under which the Christian Church was placed. There had been, for a long time, a pause and lull in the storm, so much so that Origen looks back to the days of persecution much as we do to the period of the penal laws, and speculates on the motives that might have led the great enemy of the Church to refrain from affording her children such opportunities of displaying the heroic fortitude of the faith. He anticipated, however, that this repose might very soon again be disturbed, as was in fact the case a very few years later, by the terrible persecution under Decius.

A third great evidence was found by Origen in what he calls the *ἵχνη*, or traces and vestiges of miraculous agency which still existed in the Church. In one sense, the age of miracles had vanished—that is, of those miracles the certainty and simplicity of which, as well as their stupendous magnitude, belonged to a primitive epoch; analogous, as regards the Church and the Divine action, to the physical forces which operated in the beginnings of the material universe. But in another sense, miraculous processes of a less assured kind, convincing, indeed, to the mind of faith, but which hover on the confines where the natural and supernatural come in contact—answers to prayer—*χαρίσματα*—*grazie*, these are continually exhibited; and sometimes miraculous phenomena more startling. A fourth branch of the Origenian evidence is prophecy and its fulfilment. This had great influence upon his mind, and this, too, his unscrupulous opponent made great efforts to bring down. The great and culminating argument in this division (always reserving an unapproachable place to those relating to

the Incarnation, Life, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord) was the destruction of Jerusalem, following with such appalling significance in so brief a space of time, less than the ordinary duration of a man's life, the great and crowning act of national guilt committed by the Jews in crucifying our Lord.

IV. We proceed to consider a different and larger exhibition of the opening objection of Celsus, already described. To Greek writers on subjects connected with political society, there was no idea more familiar than that of *faction*; no evils to which they were more keenly alive, from the traditions of their State histories, than those caused by men's banding together and forming associations independent of the community. Greek political orthodoxy regards the State or governing Power as all in all, and it was essential to the perfection of its ideal that there should be no thinking and acting independently of the organised body, but that the whole State should act as one man: yet to this very ideal was due an opposite result. Every city was torn asunder by factious, each of which sought to make its own principles exclusively prevail, and some have been ready to banish or massacre all who were opposed to them, and in their turn to constitute a policy as intolerant as that which they overturned. The revolutions which brought all the regions washed by the Mediterranean waters under one sovereign intensified rather than abated the disposition to regard the State as all in all, and to abhor the notion of men separating off into States within the State, into associations unrecognised by the law, and in their turn hostile to it. Public writers then naturally saw in the polity of Christianity such a faction and such a factious spirit. But Celsus went far back even beyond the cradle of Christianity, and maintained that Judaism, the parent stock of Christianity, itself originated in a *στάσις*. He sought to show that the original source of Jewish nationality was the migration of a faction from Egypt, which had quitted its native soil from that quarrelsome self-willed character which was represented in its descendants obstinately preferring their own ways to those of the State. Christianity, he contended, had parted asunder from Judaism, as the Jews had broken off from the Egyptians, and in its turn, after the unanimity of its early days, when it could reckon but few adherents, had split up into many factions—that is, the heresies having but one thing in common, the Christian name. The paucity of numbers, here incidentally taken for granted by Celsus, is denied by Origen. The Christians at the beginning were of course few as compared with the multitudes that afterwards floated in, but not few absolutely, for it was the crowds that followed Jesus into the desert that excited the jealousy of the Jews against Him, and

led them to plot against His life. But passing over that question, how had Christianity about it the marks of faction? The answer that seems first to have occurred to the mind of Origen is characteristically suggested by the most prominent of the attributes connected with faction in the mind of antiquity. The readers of Thucydides and Xenophon need not be reminded that nothing belonged to it more essentially than a reckless indifference to shedding blood. Had Christianity arisen out of faction, "the legislator of the Christians" could never have absolutely forbidden taking man's life, or reproved the attempt on human life made by His own disciples (alluding to St. Peter's use of the sword). In the same spirit Origen elsewhere assumes that it is unlawful for Christians to serve in the army, and not merely on the ground of the sinfulness of sharing in an unjust war. It is an example of the manner in which an expositor who of all others would insist on the principle of interpreting Scripture by the spirit and not the letter, has erred by seeking a formal law in a case which our Lord made use of to show the temper in which His true followers should meet injustice. In substance, however, the answer is sound. It comes to this: that Christianity converted the world by persuasion and not by force, and it is easy to read in that sense the words of Origen without accepting the Quaker-like inference they convey, which could be disposed of not only by the authority of the Church, but by examples such as that of Cornelius in the Acts of the Apostles, who we do not find quitted his post in the Roman army when he became a Christian. To return to Celsus: in the same spirit in which he accuses the Christians of originating in faction, he says, "If all men should desire to be Christians, these people would not wish their conversion any longer." Even at that early stage we see anticipated occasional complaints that Catholics form a clique and are addicted to exclusive ways of living. Origen's answer to this also is instructive and interesting, as to the state of Christian "propagandism" and the position of Christians in society at that period. It is not often he speaks with the indignant emphasis he here exhibits:

That such a statement is *a lie*, is plain from the fact that Christians, so far as depends on themselves, neglect not the sowing of the Word everywhere in the world (*τῆς οἰκουμένης*); some, at any rate, have made it their business to go forth round about not only cities, but villages and farmsteads, that they may also settle others in piety towards God. And one could not say they do this for the sake of wealth, since at times they do not even receive what is required for their sustenance. Now, when through the multitude of those who come to the faith, rich people, and some in dignified positions, and ladies of family and fashion favour the servants of the Word, perhaps

some one will venture to say that it is for the sake of a little glory that certain persons support the Christian doctrine : yet it is impossible to suspect this reasonably at the beginning, when the danger, especially to the teachers, was great. And now the discredit with the rest of the world is greater than the glory supposed to be reaped among those who think with us, and that not by all.—*Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 116.

V. We have seen that Celsus regarded heresies as the normal state of Christianity, as showing that spirit of faction and opposition out of which it in his view arose, and to which it was ever tending. Origen's manner of disposing of this objection is very peculiar, and, it must be said, requires a very favourable construction to reconcile it with faith. He denies the fact that the Christians were unanimous at the outset. There were great differences as to what books were to be accepted among the Scriptures, and no small question, even whilst the Apostles were still preaching and the eye-witnesses of Jesus were still teaching His doctrine, as to the obligation of the Jewish customs. Some held that the Resurrection was already over, some disputed whether the day of the Lord was at hand or not, and St. Paul's caution to avoid "the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so-called," showed that there were variations even when the faithful were as yet few in numbers. The undeniable fact of the swarm of heresies that infested the world soon after Apostolic times he disposes of, not by the equally patent fact which is to be obtained even from this treatise, of one acknowledged Christian society, the Church diffused over the world, and incapable of error, but by contending that αἰρέσεις were always sure to arise on all subjects that were useful to mankind. Thus there were sects in the profession of medicine, and sects in the study of philosophy ; it need not therefore be matter of surprise if there were sects in Christianity. It will be perceived that, using the word "heresies" in the beginning of this paragraph, we write it Greek in what follows, and this is to note the fallacy into which Origen falls in his use of the word. The word αἵρεσις, as applied to different schools in the profession of medicine, implied nothing that was unreasonable. There is no authority in that, or any other mere human branch of knowledge, from which it is any sin to differ. Empirics (using the word in its primitive sense, which meant no disparagement) among the ancient physicians, homœopaths in our own day, might divide the medical world without offence. And even in philosophy, one αἵρεσις, as such, had as much claim to be accepted as another, none of them pretending to any other source than the unassisted human reason. But Origen must have been well aware that αἵρεσις carried with it, in Christianity,

marks of condemnation which it did not and could not in the field of human thought. He omits here to refer to the text, "a man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition avoid," or to the enumeration of heresies among "the works of flesh," but says that St. Paul seems to him to have spoken admirably when he told the Corinthians: *Oportet et hæreses esse, ut et qui probati sunt, manifesti fiant in vobis*, and argues from the advantage the physician or philosopher would derive from studying the views of the various sects in their respective provinces, to the conclusion that "he who has diligently looked into the αἱρέσεις of Judaism and Christianity would become the wisest Christian." The drift of his reasoning here would seem to take αἱρέσεις, not as so many sinful habits, though in the field of the intellect, but as "guesses at truth," of a nature that would make them instructive, even though erroneous.

It is not to be denied that a line of argument like this is *male sonans*, although an apologetic view may be taken of it, founded on the fact that all heresies may be considered as imperfect, and therefore positively deceptive statements of some truth in the Christian system, which, if insulated from the rest, is sure to become false doctrine. Thus, insist on Christ's human nature alone, and you become Arian, or Ebionite, or Unitarian. But we may explain Origen's reasoning upon general grounds, without supposing him thus indifferent to the first elements of a Catholic Christian's habitude of mind. It must be remembered that he is pleading a cause against an opponent who admits of no appeal but to the human reason. To attempt to silence Celsus by the authority of the Church would have been what the conditions of the duel, if we may use the expression, would not admit; and the Christian apologist therefore is often tempted to place his argument in a light which will recommend it to those who would judge upon the principles of his adversary. It is in fact "the lowest ground" on which disputants like Butler and Paley proceed, and may be compared to the reasoning by which Stoical philosophers like Seneca, and Chrysippus before him, endeavoured to show, that even on the lines of those sects which made pleasure the supreme end, the happy life could still only be attained by virtue. But independently of such general considerations, there occurs enough incidentally in this treatise to prove that Origen, however he might think it necessary to keep this principle of faith in reserve, nay, however his natural constitution of mind might be called heretical, as all constitutions have in them a bias towards some form of evil, though this is the most fatal, still desired to submit to the authority of the Church. We proceed to present a few passages that appear in point.

We find Origen arguing as follows:—"Granted that there are those among us who deny the identity of [our] God and the God of the Jews; but those at any rate are not to be accused who demonstrate from the same Scripture that the God of Jews and Gentiles is the same." So far, perhaps, the Protestant disputant would urge that he appeals to Scripture alone. But observe the next paragraph:—"Granted there is a third class consisting of those who style some persons as 'of the soul,' others as 'of the spirit' [ψυχικούς and πνευματικούς, implying a distinction predestinating them to eternal loss or to salvation], and I suppose he means the Valentinians. Well, what is this to us, *who are of the Church*, who accuse those who introduce natures that from their constitution are to be saved, or from their constitution to be lost?" And further on:—"Granted there be those who receive Jesus, as boasting thereby to be Christians, but who still desire to live also according to the law of the Jews, like the multitudes of the Jews (and these are the two sets of Ebionites, either confessing, like us, Jesus born of the Virgin or that He was not so born, but as the rest of mankind), what charge does this import against *those of the Church*, whom Celsus has styled those of the multitude?" (v. p. 272). So, in reasoning on the doctrine of the Resurrection, he says:—"We, persuaded that that which is sowed is not quickened, except it die, &c., observe both *the mind* (βούλημα) *of the Church of Christ*, and the greatness of the promise" (v. p. 246). Again, in noticing certain wild fancies of the heretics, which Celsus had ascribed to Christianity, he remarks:—"Celsus does not understand *the doctrines delivered by the Church* [τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας], which very few are trained to comprehend who have devoted all their lives according to the command of Jesus to searching the Scriptures" (vi. p. 300). These passages are quite sufficient to show that, although for the purposes of this treatise, wisely or unwisely, Origen does not make the authority of the Church a prominent element in the controversy, it lies at the foundation of his mind. We say this, remembering also passages like the following:—"Divine Wisdom then, being different from faith, is the first of what are called the graces (χαρίσματα) of God; and second after it, to those who know how to be exact in such matters, is what is called Knowledge; and the third (since the simpler sort too must be saved, who approach the worship of God according to their ability) is Faith" (vi. p. 284). There seems nothing here that might not be understood in the sense in which St. Thomas speaks of the possibility of some things which are of faith to the unlearned, being matters of knowledge to the deep theologian, though certainly the habit of faith is not parted with, when a special vision is accorded to the intellect.

VI. We have hinted that a reply of a more general nature to this immediate difficulty may be obtained from a line of argument which he uses in reference to an important objection of his adversary's. The reader will remember the famous stanza in Pope's "Universal Prayer," so little in keeping with the character of a professed Catholic as he was who wrote it :—

Father of all, in every age,
In every clime adored ;
By saint, by savage and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

Well, this sentiment is identical with a view put forth by Celsus, to show that the Mosaic revelation concerning the nature and attributes of God contained nothing that differed essentially from what was already known to the world. The shepherds and goatherds who followed Moses, he said, held that there was one God, calling this Universe by the name of the Most High, or Adonai, or Sabaoth, or whatever appellation they pleased, and knew nothing beyond that. It made no difference whether the Supreme God was called by the usual name among the Greeks, Jews, or such and such a name among the Indians, or such and such among the Egyptians. Origen takes the far deeper view, that names are not such a matter of indifference as his infidel antagonist assumed they were. There were three theories current in the ancient schools as to the origin of names—that is, of language. Aristotle held that names were arbitrary and conventional—*θέσει*, that is, *ex instituto*, to use the familiar phrase in Aldrich ; the Stoics, that they were natural—*φύσει*, that is, imitative ; the Epicureans also referred them to nature, but in a different sense, not as imitative of things, but as spontaneously uttered by the first men, and called into existence by the impact of objects on their senses and minds. Origen derives names, at least of the sacred character attaching to those above mentioned, not from any association with accidental and material objects, but from "a secret theology depending on the Creator of the universe"—that is, he holds that primarily they were given to man by revelation. To confound the revealed names of the Almighty with those apparently analogous names supplied by Paganism would be like giving the Name of God to lifeless matter ; or again, in ethics, the name of good and of the *honestum* to wealth, or bodily well-being, or nobility of birth. In proof of the mysterious depth and efficacy of names, he urges the power which the name of Jesus had, in countless instances, displayed of banishing demons from the possessed ; and Christian martyrs showed their feeling for the principle it involves, in refusing, at the cost of their lives, to give the *name* of God to Jupiter. And he saw a confirmation of this essential

importance of names in the fact to which he more than once adverts, that in magical incantations it was found that names operative in one language lost their power if translated into another; invocations became inefficient if the sounds were varied.

VII. Origen, then, is strongly impressed with the dangerous confusion of thought caused by imagining that the *names* of various objects of worship express no essential difference, or that they can be with safety interchanged. We might with advantage, in certain branches of allied controversy, reverse his argument in this way: We can neither safely assume that different names, in different religions or sects, stand for the same objects, nor yet that the same apparent idea, or the same apparent practice in different religions and sects and ages, is identical or to be regarded as equivalent. We use the principle here broadly stated to meet a difficulty which appears on the very surface of this treatise. We allude to the well-known fact that Celsus accuses the Christians of having neither temples nor altars nor images, and that Origen boldly accepts the charge, and gives reasons why the Christians had none of these things. The bearing of this double argument on the controversy with Protestants is obvious. It admits of being met upon different grounds, and differently too with reference to the various classes of disputants who may urge it. For Anglican controversialists of whatever shade, and for most modern Protestants in different degrees, the argument would certainly prove a great deal too much. It would disallow of any use of devotional pictures; it would sweep away altars, and churches with them. On the other hand, strange as it may seem to have been thus broadly and emphatically put, the argument is at variance with known facts, such as the statue of our Lord at Cæsarea, mentioned by Eusebius, the representations on the religious objects found in the catacombs, and the whole drift of patristic theology. We should prefer, however, to answer it on the more general principle we have indicated, and which we proceed to develop. It is known that in chemistry the same elements in different combinations have totally different powers, and what, in one compound, may be harmless or beneficial, in another is poisonous. This may help us to understand the widely-different force of allied or even identical thoughts and actions according to their place in different and hostile systems.

The offence of idolatry consisted in the rendering to the creature the honour due to the Creator, and this might be exhibited in various ways. The great general characteristic in all seems in fact to be the elevation by the human imagina-

tion of something, whether real or fantastic, into the rank of an independent cause from which good or evil may come, irrespective of Almighty God. The presentation of such a cause by the imagination to the worship of the will is idolatry, whether exhibited in the form of an external picture or image, or not. If, however, the danger of transferring to the creature the incommunicable honour of the Creator be absolutely absent, the use of representations in worship becomes a thing indifferent, depending for its lawfulness on the same authority which throughout a whole dispensation forbade it. There has always been in the world an authority to declare religious truth and to govern religious usage. We do not conceal the fact that the pagans advanced much the same argument to justify some of the forms of idolatry we have enumerated as we should apply in defending the *cultus* of the saints and the reverence paid to holy images—viz., that the honour done to these inferior objects of worship was a relative one, having ultimate reference to the Most High, which is to be found among the arguments given from Celsus by Origen. But this is easily met by the answer that the Supreme God of Celsus is not the God of Christianity, or at any rate is so distorted by the false medium through which he is seen, as to deprive the pagan reasoner of such appeal; and finally, that, without exception, the inferior objects of pagan devotion had no claim even to relative worship. Origen was right in appealing to a prohibition of the use of images, so far as the custom of the Church of that day forbade it; but though this has been changed, idolatry is still, as ever, forbidden upon grounds that must always hold good.

In this, as in many other questions of doctrine and discipline, the study of such an author as Origen can hardly fail to lead a student who holds the first principle of faith and authority to the acceptance of a prudent and measured theory of development. We find ourselves plunged as it were into a world where all our familiar ideas are to be found, but found energizing in an inchoate state, some of them invisible except to the practised eye, some present indeed, but as yet in apparent conflict with the rest. "The seeds of things" are there, but "which will grow and which will not," individual Christians could not have pronounced with articulate belief. Such a theory might be largely illustrated by Origen's whole teaching on the subject of the Godhead and Sonship of our Blessed Lord and His Incarnation. He almost exhausts the powers of the language in His praise, and yet somehow just falls short of the fulness with which in less than a century the Church enunciated the idea. This is an evident anxiety to restrain the superlative exaltation of the Deity of the Son, which was not needed, when all had

fallen into its place, and the *ὁμοούσιον* had crowned and sealed the Church's doctrine on that point. There being, however, no conscious, intentional hostility to the full truth, the teaching of a great Christian thinker at that early stage remains, in spite of its inevitable imperfections, a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*. Take another illustration, and upon a point disputed by many who do not dream of questioning the *ὁμοούσιον*—the invocation of angels. Origen distinctly rejects it. Its utility had not yet been enunciated as of faith. His point of view was such as to incline him to keep it in the background. But yet, in the midst of pages that are quite auriferous to the student who hunts the patristic writings for scraps that read like Protestantism, we find that there is still, behind all his disclaimers, a sense of devotion towards the holy angels that was but as it were waiting the moment for expansion. Celsus had said: "From our adoring, with God, His Son, it follows that according to us [the Christians] not God only, but His ministers are worshipped." In replying to this, Origen thus guards himself:

If he had meant those who are truly ministers of God after the Only-Begotten of God, Gabriel, Michael, and the other angels and arch-angels, and had said these ought to be worshipped; perhaps, purifying his expression concerning worship and the acts of the worshippers, we might, as arguing on things so great, have stated such views on the subject as our capacity allowed us to form regarding it; but now, when he holds the demons adored by the Gentiles to be ministering spirits, he does not bring us to accept his conclusion as to worshipping such as them, whom the Word declares to be ministers of the Evil one, and of the prince of this world, who makes those whom he can to revolt from God.—*Contra Celsum*, viii. p. 386.

The argument of the apologist is entirely directed against the *pagan* notions. He cannot allow the slightest admission that could be turned in favour of worshipping the demons, or any worship of angels which Christianity could sanction to be brought, in kind or degree, into the same category with the other.

VIII. The great principle of total distinctness of idea and essence, in spite of all outward resemblance, pervades Origen's treatment of the subject of the miracles. It was a prominent argument of Celsus that the miracles of our Lord were effected by magic, and it is remarkable that he should have recourse to this argument rather than to any attempt to deny their truth. He mentions as commonly exhibited in the market-places for a few pence, marvels by performers who had learned them from the Egyptians, and who expelled demons from the possessed, drove away diseases by exsufflation, raised the souls of heroes,

displayed costly banquets on tables, and dainties and viands that were unreal, but all manifest to appearance.* We imagine that we are reading about the phenomena that puzzled the world recently in the case of Mr. Home, or those, now forgotten, of which so curious an account is given in Wraxall's "Memoirs" as having upset the common sense of infidel courtiers at Berlin in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Still more extraordinary are facts, real or pretended, which Celsus relates of the oracles of Æsculapius still going on in the third century of the Christian era.† The god was believed visibly and palpably to appear to those who consulted him, again reminding us, only in a form more complete, of the manifestation of hands which was such a favourite part of Mr. Home's exhibitions. The acknowledged occurrence of such strange effects in the pagan world were to Origen but an argument for the corresponding effects in Christianity. "It seems to me," he says, "that we ought to state this as applicable universally, that when there is something worse which affects to be homogeneous with something better, there must needs be found something better on the opposite side;" and the mere outward resemblance was no ground for supposing that the cause of the two was identical, just as in Nature there are species radically distinct, though superficially alike. The effects of the two classes of miracles proved an essential difference between them. None of the magicians who did the extraordinary feats above-mentioned invited the spectators thereby to correct their moral character, or trained them in the fear of God, or sought to persuade them so to live as to be justified by God. They neither did these things, nor could do them, nor even wished to do them, being themselves full of the most shameful and infamous sins. Now the miracles of Jesus were directed to the bettering of those who witnessed them, and to induce His disciples to teach men according to the will of God, that the rest of the world, learning more from His word and character than from these marvels, might refer all their actions to please Almighty God. How, then, could His miracles be reasonably placed on the same footing with those of the pagan enchanters?

IX. The same principle is used in meeting phenomena urged by Celsus as parallel to the Resurrection of Jesus. They are mostly vague stories, culled from Herodotus and Plutarch, such as those of the apparitions of Aristæas and Cleomedes; and as to these Paganism made no claim for any moral effect produced by them upon the world. It is upon similar grounds that Origen argues for the antecedent probability that there

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 53.

† *Ibid.*, iii. p. 124.

would be prophecies in a revealed system like Judaism. The Gentiles had their oracles, and the appetency of man to look into the future would not be left without a supply in a religion coming from God, analogous to that which Paganism had anticipated.* Origen thereupon is quite prepared to allow there was in Gentile thought and practice much that resembled revealed truth, and finds no difficulty in the fact. His opponent had eagerly used it on the side of Paganism, and places early in the list of his arguments that Christianity and Judaism, not merely in the material proofs by which it was recommended but as a system, in its doctrines and practices, had each borrowed from the religions which it announced itself as superseding. It contained, he said, nothing new, but was a remoulding of old λόγοι, long familiar to the world. It was to be expected that the Egyptian religion, with its imposing antiquity, elaborate mythology, splendid ritual, and early relation to Judaism, would be called in to assist this part of the objector's reasoning, yet not much is made of this topic. He commenced, however, with the following singular illustration:—

He wants (says Origen) to compare our faith with the Egyptian practices. Among them, one is met, on approaching, by splendid precincts and groves, and great and beautiful gateways, and marvellous temples, and magnificent pavilions all around, and very religious and mysterious forms of worship. But now on entering and getting further within there is seen receiving adoration a cat, or a monkey, or a crocodile, or a goat, or a dog. . . . [The Christians] laugh at the Egyptians, though they offer many not contemptible enigmas, when they teach that such things are honour done to eternal ideas, and not, as the many think, to animals that have but ephemeral existence. But they are simple, when they introduce in their discussion about Jesus things in nowise more serious than the goats and dogs among the Egyptians.—*Contra Celsum*, iv. p. 120.

The scornful, bitter, and blasphemous style of this objection should not make us neglect to remark the aspect in which Christianity must have presented itself to an objector who could use this language. Evidently it appeared to him, in spite of all his clamour against its supposed patronage of ignorance, a vast and complicated system of thought—such a system as could only be hindered by temporary circumstances from being represented to the external eye by a ritual system not less imposing. Origen's reply to this branch of his opponent's argument appeals to the deep and mystical teaching, the wisdom taught to the perfect in the Christian system, and challenges him to interpret the Epistles of St. Paul, naming those addressed to the Ephesians, Colossians,

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 28.

Thessalonians, Philippians, and Romans. This reply, however to the point as to the last-mentioned objection, still does not account for the impression which the outward aspect of Christianity had evidently produced upon Celsus, judging from the passage we have quoted, and which the apologist leaves unnoticed.

Although Celsus does not appear to have alleged that Christianity, as such, borrowed ideas from the Egyptian religion, he did pretend that the Jewish rite of circumcision came from Egypt, the Egyptians and Colchians having had it before the Israelites (i. p. 17). He pointed also to the Egyptian laws of abstinence from certain kinds of flesh as a proof that the Jewish prohibition of pork was not a peculiar institution. Origen answers the objection as to circumcision at first by remarking that it rests on Celsus' preferring Egyptian testimony to Jewish, but afterwards more elaborately upon the principle as now already stated—viz., that the Egyptian and Colchian circumcision differed essentially from the Jewish in the purpose, law, and intention of the circumciser, which made the rite a different thing in the respective cases, to which he adds the circumcision of the Ismaelite Arabs, which the Jews distinguished from that of Judaism, notwithstanding that Ismael was circumcised along with Abraham. He goes off, however, into suggestions of a kind highly characteristic of his style of thought, and where a modern controversialist could not profitably follow him, throwing out the idea that the rite was performed by way of protection against an angel hostile to the race of the Jews, and able to injure those of them who were uncircumcised, but powerless as against the circumcised, and that all his power over those who were circumcised in this religion was overthrown by the Incarnation and Circumcision of Jesus. This strange view would require to be illustrated by other passages where Origen sets forth his ideas concerning the office of angels in the administration of the world. Thus, he treats the subjection of the Jews to the Assyrians and Babylonians, not merely as their reduction under the dominion of those nations, but as their being handed over to be chastised by the ἄρχοντες, by the ruling angels of the same, their own ἄρχων permitting it for a time, that, as if avenging himself, he might get authority to draw out of those other nations such subjects as he could, give them laws and ordain them a rule of life to bring them to the end to which otherwise those would have attained, who had originally been committed to him. The above ideas, for instance, look much like the notion of regarding our Blessed Lord as an æon, a being of the angelic type, however ineffably exalted, rather than as God of One Substance with the Father ;

although in their misty light one could not make out with certainty that he means to allude to our Lord at all.

The pagan objector brings the resemblance he imagines himself to trace between the ideas of Christianity and those of Greek heathenism into greater relief than he does its supposed borrowings from the doctrines or rites found among the Egyptians. In the first place, he contends that certain of the histories of the Old Testament are merely reproductions of the familiar legends of Greek mythology; for example, that the history of Noe was borrowed from that of Deucalion; that the Tower of Babel was a distorted recollection of the war of the Aloïdæ against the gods; and that the burning of the cities of the Plain represented the conflagration which punished the presumption of Phaethon; and again, having recourse to philosophical notions, that the final judgment in which the sins of the world will be condemned to everlasting fire, had been suggested by the alternate physical revolutions of the universe, in which deluges have been succeeded by the destructive action of the fiery element; and he scoffs at the idea of the Almighty descending like a torturer, wielding fire for the punishment of the offenders. These objections are met by Origen, partly on the fact that the writings of Moses were long anterior to those of the authors from whom come the poetic legends referred to; and, so far as regards the last-mentioned theory, by an argument to show that the final destruction by fire is to be understood, not in a material, but a figurative way, the wood, hay, stubble, of which the Apostle speaks, being plainly figurative, and therefore, he urges, the fire which is to consume them should also be so interpreted. Here, too, he speaks with much reserve, but his reasoning, as before, is unsatisfactory, and, as addressed to an infidel, imprudent.

In the same spirit, Celsus argued that in worshipping their Lord, Who was made captive and Who died, the Christians only acted like the Getæ who worshipped Zamolxis; the Cilicians, Mopsus; the Acarnanians, Amphiloehus; the Thebans, Amphiaræus; and the Lebadeans, Trophonius; to which list he was not ashamed to add the worship which had been established in Egypt to Antinous, the vile favourite of the Emperor Hadrian, and confirmed, as was said, at Antinopolis, the seat of that strange idolatry, by vengeance with which the deified Antinous visited those who had offended him. This parallelism is partly met by Origen with distinctions of which we have already stated the difficulty and the probable explanation—viz., that the Christians erected neither temples nor statues in honour of Jesus, as the heathen did to those objects of their idolatry. We may add to what has been said, that Origen

seems to fall here into language very doubtful as to orthodoxy, observing that He is "midway between the nature of the Unbegotten and that of all begotten beings" (iii. p. 131). He goes on to propose a dilemma to his opponent: either these demons, or gods or heroes, had no existence, and put forth no power at the abodes sacred to them at Lebadea, Thebes, and elsewhere (and if he thought so, he was an Epicurean, and his defence of the pagan religion was inconsistent and false), or else they did exist and were what he pretended. In the latter case, he admitted that Jesus had also been able to make multitudes believe that He came from God; and if so, that He was stronger than the beings among whom Celsus had numbered Him. For they tolerated the worship of others. He, as confident in His superior might, forbade them to be received, as being wicked demons who had taken places on the earth into their possession, because they could not touch a region purer and more divine, where the coarse defilements, "the smoke and stir of this dim spot," could not make their way. Once more, Origen seems not to have sufficiently grasped the essential difference, unapproachable and beyond all thought of comparison, between Jesus and the heroes of the pagan world, and, he might have added, the saints. An admission that placed Him on their level, or even inconceivably higher and stronger, was as nothing; and the clearness and energy with which every Catholic must feel this, is only one among the proofs of the supreme injustice of charging the Bride of Christ with idolatry. When Origen said, she erected neither temples nor statues to Him, he was right, if he meant, as he must be taken to mean, no temples and no statues in the sense in which either term was understood by the pagans who surrounded him; no temples like Delphi, where some earth-loving demon was supposed to haunt, whom primitive Christianity regarded with the feeling with which the modern world would think of a ghoul or a vampire; no statues, representing either "nothing in the world" or beings only hostile alike to God and man, or objects regarded as having in themselves any principle or power apart from, and independent of the Creator. But temples there already were, where the Unbloody Sacrifice was offered, which the heathen only heard of in wild and fantastic fancies; and statues there either were, or were soon to be permitted to the faithful, raising their minds by their holy symbolism to the God of gods, and to His servants whom He has called Gods in a sense relative and limited, He, whose eternal and infinite greatness no created thing can approach, not even the universe itself, that *Kosmos* which, but for revelation, men might have been pardoned for imagining to be divine.

To consider another form of parallelism, which Celsus drew between the worship of the deified men of heathenism and that of Christ, he asked, why should Æsculapius, or Dionysus, or Hercules, after they had put off their mortal flesh, not be regarded as gods rather than Jesus? The answer is very obvious to all whose conscience had not been dulled by the general depravity of the pagan world. Origen demands: "What was there that Æsculapius, or Dionysus, or Hercules did of such magnitude as to deserve it? Or whom could they show that had been bettered as to their moral character, and become more elevated by their sayings or their lives, that these men should become gods? We may read the numerous tales about them, and see whether they were clear from licentiousness, or injustice, or folly, or cowardice; and if nothing of the sort were found in them, then Celsus' argument might be strong, where it places the above-mentioned on the same level with Jesus."*

We see, again, that the apologist takes lower ground than he need, or than is desirable. The fabled lives, indeed, of Hercules and the others named were such as he says, but had they been like those of Socrates or Marcus Aurelius, Celsus' argument could not have been more valid. Indeed, in another place, Celsus does put Epictetus and those like him in contrast with our Lord, giving, as was natural for him to do, the preference to the former. The two ideas of heathen pride and Christian humility are totally distinct and incommensurable, and the preference for the latter, and the perception of the moral viciousness of the former, must in the end be decided by Divine grace acting on the soul; though men will judge differently in youth, strength, wealth, and prosperity, than they do when in weakness and affliction; and though, happily for the world, it is too much overspread with sorrow for the bulk of mankind not to be forced to recognise the grand proof of Christianity which is found in its results, as they are seen on the great field of human society.

X. This latter argument is often pressed by Origen with great power. As to miracles, strange performances are talked of in heathen tradition attaching to names of which little otherwise was known. But what had these men done? And what was there to show why miraculous powers should be supposed to have energized in them? "The note of sanctity" indeed, to use the terminology of later Catholic theology, is one of his strongest points. A remarkable example of this is to be found in the third book, where he contrasts the demeanour of the Christian Churches of Athens, Corinth, and Alexandria, and of

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 136.

their councils, with that of the assemblies and the councils of those pagan cities respectively; the conduct of the members of a Christian congregation with the wild passions of the Athenian *dēmos*, which still, under Roman domination, was permitted to hold its assemblies, doubtless as fickle and unprincipled as ever they were, however shorn of their power. Of what restored Corinth was, we can form an idea from the stormy scene through which St. Paul passed there before the tribunal of the Proconsul; and as for Alexandria, Paris in the days of the Revolution was not more frantic than the Alexandrian mob could show itself. He then passes on to the ecclesiastical magistrates and princes—that is, the priests and the bishops—and contrasts their life with that of the rulers in the city hostile to that of God; and he does this in a tone that shows an assured conviction, in which all who heard him would share.*

Before quitting this part of the subject, we would remark that it is important to remember that the primitive idea of the word *ἐκκλησία* carries with it the idea of *authority*. The *ecclesia* in a Greek State was as supreme as our Parliament, each citizen being his own representative. It constituted a final court of appeal. Whatever other ideas might be dropped or altered when this word became part of the language of Christianity the attribute of authority certainly remained, which can be traced, as we have seen, even in Origen and in his adversary, where he speaks of the *μεγάλη ἐκκλησία*, “the great *ecclesia*,”—that is, the whole congregation of Christ’s faithful, not found in this or that city, but dispersed throughout the world.

XI. In passing on to review another class of objections, we are struck by a special difficulty in the controversy with infidels, especially of the Gentile and pagan type; we mean that each objection includes in it several false principles and assumptions, which would almost require a treatise to disentangle, and renders it, on the one hand, almost impossible to treat any one objection singly, or, on the other, to avoid repetitions. The following insolent and extravagant passage is an example in point:—

Ridiculing, after his fashion, the race of the Jews and Christians, he [Celsus] has compared them all to a cluster of bats, or to ants coming out of a nest, or to frogs congregated about a marsh, and disputing with each other who among them are the most sinful, and saying that God foretells and forewarns us of everything; and that leaving the whole universe and the heavenly orbit, and all this vast earth, he dwells with us alone, and sends messages by heralds to us alone, and ceases not to find and to seek how we may be ever with

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 128.

them. Again, they [the Jews and Christians] are like worms who should say that there is a God, and that they are come next him, born of him and like in all things to God; and all things have been made subject to us, earth and water, and air and the stars, and all things are because of us, and are ordained to serve us. But now, since some of us have offended, God will come, or will send his Son, that he may burn up the unjust, and that we who remain may have everlasting life with him. "These things," says Celsus, "we must tolerate from worms or frogs, or Jews or Christians, disputing with each other." —*Contra Celsum*, iv. p. 175.

The coarse and insolent mannerism of this passage would please vulgar and superficial minds. It is answered by Origen with that temper, and at the same time with that severity of tone, which it demands. If the comparison is to be understood to apply to men in general, it is an absurd one, because reason gives man a superiority over the brute creation, though they may surpass him in bulk or other bodily attributes; and, comparing the soul of man with that of brutes, the same reason, and the capacity for virtue which still remains even in the vilest men, places them at an immeasurable elevation over the brutes. And if Celsus meant his comparison for Jews and Christians alone, is it a fit one to make, remembering what has been effected by the Christian religion in enabling men's souls to ascend above all created things to God alone, and to do all things as in His sight and hearing? And if that be insufficient to rescue them from this insulting comparison, consider the mastery which Christianity has given over passions which find the minds of most men weak and yielding as wax. Are the possessors of such heroic virtue the brethren of worms, the kinsfolk of ants and of frogs? And can those who dwell in the brightness of justice and humanity and gentleness be fairly likened to a cluster of bats? Above all, ought this to be said of those who have learned that the body of the rational being is the temple of the God whom they worship, and who take care not to defile the temple of God by unlawful indulgences? As to the other vices which prevailed among mankind, and even among so-called philosophers, he contends they were not found at all among Christians, "or at any rate not among those who join the congregations and go to the common prayers, and are not shut out from them, unless such a person may very rarely be found hidden among the crowd." Such reasoning as this, full of passionate conviction, shows that the Christians of that day must have been visibly superior in morals to the heathen who surrounded them, and that they had a severe discipline by which the morality was maintained. And we affirm the same argument will still hold good, if applied, as

Origen applies it, to those who are Catholics in reality, and not in name. We should exclude therefore the crowds who, in most European countries, scarcely even keep up the outward profession of religion. We point, for example, to the moral purity of the Catholic population of Ireland, taken as a whole, which even our enemies will not dispute.

XII. The insulting similitude which we have just been considering does not stand alone, but is essentially connected with the theory concerning the nature of the universe, which Celsus had learned from Plato. He held that God was not the author of the material world which is subject to destruction, but only of the world of souls which is not liable to death. The material world had come from spontaneous generation, as life from different sorts of corruption (of which the fancy of bees being engendered from the putrefaction of the body of an ox, described in Virgil's "Georgics," is only one out of several of the same kind). Man, as a material being, did not differ from the lower animals; and as to the rational soul, he argued from the instinct of the brute creation, of which he alleged many fanciful illustrations after the unscientific manner of the age, that the latter did not differ from man's reason; moreover, that, in certain respects, brutes are even more favoured by the gods than man, such as their support not being gained by toil; their being supplied with weapons by Nature, and by these weapons often overpowering man; and their prescience of the future, shown in augury. He directed all these ideas against the Mosaic doctrine of creation, and the view that the material world was created for the service of man. And with this theory his view of the origin and nature of evil coincided. He held that evil was attached to matter; that it did not prevail more at one time than another; that the course of things had been, was, and always would be the same, things coming in appointed revolutions; that evil, after all, was but partial good, or tending some way or other to good in its consequences.

We can only briefly summarize the lines of thought upon which Origen meets these hostile views. Against the notion that God was not the author of matter, he throws out the idea which others have worked out in detail, as the great argument from design, or, as he calls it, *art*. It was incumbent on Celsus, in the presence of all the art exhibited in the material universe, to prove that this could not have come from a creative Mind, or a creative Mind distributing to various demiurgic agents their respective provinces. Then, as to spontaneous generation, he, too, sharing in the spirit of his age which seldom thought of testing assertions by actual and well-arranged experiments, accepts the idle stories about bees being

bred of the putrefaction of the ox, wasps from that of the horse, and so on, but sees in them symbols of the conceivability of death's ushering the soul of man into a further state of being, which he might have better illustrated by other and real transformations in Nature. That the material substances, *quæ* matter, were identical, he answers by a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*; it would follow from hence that the heavenly bodies, which all the heathen regarded as Divine, were not higher in Nature than the lowest of the organisms which surround us. The instinct of animals in all its strange manifestations he regards as intended to teach men so many moral lessons; and as to certain wonderful fables of that class which Celsus had alleged, Origen, again without venturing positively to contradict them, at least offers the just and important principle, that each species of animal is limited to one such faculty, however extraordinary, and age after age is incapable of developing it further. To the argument founded on augury, he gives, as we might expect from the hold which that delusion had upon the ancient world, an elaborate answer, partly founded on the absurdity of supposing the animals capable of giving warnings to man, whilst unable to foresee their own fates; partly on the supposition that these omens might be directed by demons for the purpose of increasing their power over the human race, for which he rather finds a presumption in the fact that the animals of augury (for by no means all animals were supposed to be significant of the future) were among those classed as impure by the Mosaic revelation. That the brute creation, and even the vegetable, shared with man in the benefits afforded by the action of the sun and of other physical agents, was no proof that they were more than, or equally with man, the final cause of the existence of those agents. As well might it be argued that the dogs were the end for which the ædiles ordered the arrangements of a city, though they could not but have their share of advantage from what was intended for the service of the citizens. Into the question of the origin of evil, Origen does not go very deeply in this treatise, but lays down the principle, that each man's own *ἡγεμονικόν*—that is, the ruling principle, the conscience, the will in each man's mind, and not matter, is the cause of the evil that exists in him, and that the acts resulting therefrom, and nothing else, are evils. The question is worked out in much greater detail in an interesting extract from Origen or his school, given in the "Philocalia," where the writer shows that matter cannot be the source of evil, because evil, strictly speaking, always consists in an *action*, and an action is wholly distinct from matter. In the same extract is some ingenious metaphysical reasoning

showing the inconsistency of referring evil to matter, since matter—that is, the original matter—is destitute of quality, whereas evil comes under the category of quality. This may be sufficient to show the nature of the difficulties with which Christian disputants had to contend, under this head, with those who came to them from the philosophical schools, and of the necessity under which they found themselves of mastering the theories of the sects.

XIII. We now proceed to exemplify more in detail the line of attack which Celsus directed against the great facts of the Christian revelation, partly in the character of the Jewish disputant. Origen was well accustomed to the Jewish field of argument, and finds that his opponent was but indifferently versed in it, as he puts expressions into the mouth of his Jew which were unknown or seldom heard in the Hebrew schools. We find incidentally that the Jews were at that period in a state of what may be called national senility, nothing great or imposing was to be found among them, and conversions from among them were rarer and less satisfactory than those from heathenism. We shall take in order the leading points as follows :—The Incarnation ; Birth of our Lord from a Virgin ; His Baptism ; the History of the Passion ; His Resurrection.

The idea of the Incarnation seems to have suggested to the mind of Celsus very much the same style of objection with which we are so familiar in the polemics of modern Protestantism against Catholicity. He accused the Christians of being carnal-minded, of loving the body, and said they were φιλοσώματων γένος, precisely as Protestants would contend that in believing Transubstantiation we take an earthly, fleshly, corporeal view of what ought to be spiritually understood. Origen scarcely meets this objection in the present treatise on the deep basis which is the only sufficient one—the necessity of the Incarnation for the rehabilitation of fallen human nature. In more than one place he endeavours to evade it by alleging the passage of St. Paul, “ If we have known Christ according to the flesh, now we know Him so no longer ;” as if it meant that Christ gradually raised us to know Him as He was antecedently to His taking man’s flesh upon Him, and not rather that we know Him as the Saviour of all, not in a mere earthly and human way, as the Jews might have imagined Him the Messiah for their own nation only. He offers as a prominent reason for the suffering and death of our Lord, that there are in the nature of things deep and mysterious causes why great evils are averted by innocent suffering, of which examples are afforded in Greek mythology. This, in substance, has been powerfully worked out by Butler in the

"Analogy," yet in his own manner of appealing to the facts that meet us in the ordinary moral government of the world, where there is so much vicarious and substituted suffering daily going on. Origen truly regards the great Sacrifice as needed to break the power of that fallen Angel whose dominion over mankind had assumed proportions so portentous by the time of our Lord's Incarnation. We might, however, desiderate a more complete and clear exposition from a mind so full of the fire of Divine love as his undoubtedly was, did we not bear in mind that he is reasoning with an infidel and a pagan, and was bound to place himself in the point of view likeliest to recommend his proofs to the pagan intellect.

Very many of Celsus' objections are based on the supposed inconsistency between the facts of the Christian revelation and what God *ought* to have done under the circumstances. Thus, he asks, why need He have been born in the womb of a Virgin and not rather have otherwise moulded a human body around Him, or why did He appear in one corner of the world and not rather appear simultaneously in various quarters of the world? Again, He *ought* to have appeared in form, stature, eloquence, and persuasiveness, such as to have carried all before Him; He *ought* to have been like the sun, displaying His own evidence; He *ought* to have taken summary vengeance on His judges; He *ought* to have made proof of His Deity by suddenly disappearing from the Cross; He *ought* to have appeared to the world generally after His resurrection, and not here and there to a few. A general and, to minds that already accept natural religion, satisfying answer to that class of objections is furnished by the principle which Origen has formulized in his commentary on the Psalms (given in the "Philocalia," c. ii., and which is quoted by Butler, containing, indeed, the germ of his whole system):—"A man who has once admitted that these Scriptures come from the Creator of the world, ought to be persuaded that whatever difficulties meet those who investigate into the *rationale* of the creation will also meet them as regards the Scriptures."

Arguments we have already alleged from this treatise show that Origen, without stating the principle in so many words, attributes great weight to what we may call the reflex evidence of Christianity—that is, the support given to its supernatural claims by the stupendous visible results it has effected in the world. Another application of the same principle may be found in his treatment of Celsus' objection to the history of our Blessed Lord's birth, when he contends that the life of Christ alone would show the moral impossibility, to say no more, of His having sprung from a base and infamous source,

as Celsus had blasphemously insinuated. The latter, indeed, Origen touches but slightly, and throws it aside with the disdain and abhorrence it deserved. He rests here also, as elsewhere, on the general and sure ground of the powerful reasons which there must have been to lead the disciples to spend their lives and encounter the dangers they did in preaching the facts of the life of Jesus to the world.

The question of the miraculous manifestations at our Lord's Baptism introduces some interesting remarks. Celsus had demanded what witness was there for it? and Origen replies by commenting, in the first place, on the great difficulty there must often be in establishing any history, however true, as a matter of fact. He instances, curiously to us, considering familiar historical controversies of the present day, the events of the Trojan War, or of the Seven against Thebes. If any one denied that they ever happened, arguing from the impossibilities interwoven in the common story, how could he be answered? And the same also even for the story of the Epigoni, or the Return of the Heraclidæ, where the like impossibilities do not occur.* All this he premises, as inviting the reader not to have unreasoning faith, but as showing the need of candour, of much investigation, and of entering into the mind of the writers. Here we must remark it must be remembered whom he is addressing, either persons hostile to the faith, and with whom it was a great deal, if he could even get them to give so much as a hearing to the claims of Christianity, or else persons whose faith he sought to confirm by acting upon their reason. He proceeds to state another principle, also of very general application throughout the treatise, that the difficulties urged by the objector (who here is supposed to be a Jew) would hold equally as against innumerable miraculous facts in the Old Testament—the visions, for example, of Ezechiel and Isaïas. This principle is that of analogy used in another direction: If you accept the Old Testament, you must not be startled at difficulties in the New Testament of precisely the same kind. The Law and the Prophets were full of miracles, like that of the Dove and of the voice from heaven, and the latter was established by the miracles of our Lord Himself and of His disciples, “for without mighty works they never could have moved the hearers of new words and new doctrines to abandon their ancestral traditions, and accept their doctrines in the face of dangers that threatened their lives.” As to the heavens being opened at our Lord's Baptism, Origen adopts a view of considerable boldness.

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 32.

He holds, not that the visible heaven was opened and its body parted asunder, but that the percipient was affected in a certain way, analogous to the action of the mind in dreams; the same power that shapes its ruling principle to those imaginations, might shape it also, waking, in like manner for the good of him in whom the image is shaped, and of those who shall hear him. "I do not," he says, referring to Ezechiel's vision, "suppose that the visible heaven was opened, and its body parted asunder that Ezechiel might write that; may it not thus be that he who wisely hears the Gospels may admit the like in the case of the Saviour? though this may offend the more simple, who in their great simplicity set the universe in motion, cleaving this vast united body of the whole heaven."* He proceeds in an extremely striking manner, but at greater length than we can quote, to bring the same idea to bear on the action of the other senses, as well as sight and hearing. We say this is a very bold view; we cannot think it a safe one, even at the risk of being included in the number of those whom the great Apologist calls "the more simple." We must, however, remark that it shows the danger of these accommodations to the pride of the human intellect, that in another part of the treatise we find Celsus stating as an objection to the fact of our Lord's Resurrection, this very idea of the possibility of a waking dream, and Origen there meeting it by asserting that it is impossible except in the case of those who are wholly out of their mind or labouring under frenzy or melancholia. Still, a distinction may be drawn, on the principle already given as a favourite one of Origen's. The mode of perception might resemble that of a dream, and yet the fact be real.

Among the various points discussed under the head of the Passion, the whole subject of foreknowledge receives a deep and wise treatment. Celsus had objected to certain prophecies (those concerning Judas Iscariot and St. Peter) as forcing their objects to be impious. Origen replies on the principle Butler has followed—viz., that the foreteller is not the cause of the act, but the act (in future) is the cause of its being foretold.† In replying to another remarkable, however obvious objection—viz., why our Lord did not take summary vengeance on His persecutors?—he follows the argument of analogy. We see every day how Providence spares its blasphemers.‡ But he forcibly points out also, that the real agent in the condemnation of our Lord was not Pilate, but the whole nation of the Jews, and it was obvious how the nation had visibly undergone the anger of

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 36.

† *Ibid.*, p. 73.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

Heaven since that crowning guilt, having been scattered abroad like the limbs of the mangled Pentheus, to which Celsus had alluded, in the spirit of a rhetoric that was nursed in Greek mythology.*

Concerning the Resurrection, Celsus is not careful to observe consistency in his objections more than in any other parts of his hostile array, now urging that the appearances were simply spectral, of the dim and shadowy kind spoken of in Plato's "Phædo," the σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα supposed to haunt sepulchres, and then that St. Mary Magdalene was mad, or that other witnesses were in a waking dream, which has been already noticed. As to St. Mary Magdalene, no sort of proof was alleged, and the whole history of St. Thomas was answer enough as to spectral appearances. He had imagined he might be beholding only a spirit-form resembling his Lord (and here Origen quotes from one of the most exquisitely tender passages in Homer)† :—

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ . . .
 πάντ' αὐτῷ μεγέθος τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ', εἰκυῖα,
 καὶ φωνήν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο.—*Iliad*, xxiii. 65.

Therefore Jesus, calling Thomas (proceeds Origen), said, "Put in thy finger hither, and see My hands, and bring hither thy hand, and put it into My side; and be not faithless, but believing." The paucity of our Lord's appearances after the Resurrection is explained by Origen on a principle which seems to have powerfully influenced his mind; the proportion which seems to have held in the manifestations of our Blessed Lord, to the capacity of the percipients. Thus, three only were permitted to behold His Transfiguration. All saw Him as man; and His appearances after His Resurrection were rare, and but to chosen witnesses.

XIV. What has been said must suffice as specimens of the reasoning on both sides in this famous treatise. It is hardly necessary to say that very much has been passed over, and much that is hardly less interesting than what has been selected for review, almost the whole field of the Old Testament objections, and those especially relating to the prophecies. It remains to offer some remarks on the character of Origen's mind, and his style as a controversialist. That which struck Butler as his great characteristic, his "singular sagacity," ought certainly to stand first, from respect to so deep a thinker.

* *Contra Celsum*, ii. p. 81.

† *Ibid.*, ii. p. 97.

He is highly suggestive, and powerfully, perhaps too powerfully, influences the mind of the student. One can conceive it quite an epoch in the mental history of many, when first this "great planet swims into their ken." He is very remarkable for the respect with which he treats his opponents, rarely, unless under extreme provocation, permitting himself to use any expression of anger or disdain; and this calmness of language he distinctly lays down as a principle, even in speaking of the objects of pagan idolatry. He is generally a fair reasoner, and does his utmost to meet his adversary's difficulties. On the other hand, he occasionally forgets that an argument may be capable of being retorted. One instance of this we have noticed, and a striking example of the same is the reiterated advantage he takes of an admission made by Celsus about the gods delighting in the odour of the sacrifices. He repeats this no less than nine times in the course of a few pages, though the opponent might have defended himself by the parallel of the sacrifices of the old Law—easily answered, it is true, by any mind capable of these discussions, but still too obvious to the ordinary hearer to have been wisely pressed in that way. Perhaps it is only another phase of the same constitution of mind, that he is singularly apt to introduce an idea, and then immediately dismiss it, as either not adapted to his present purpose, or treated of elsewhere in his writings. Very numerous examples might be given of this. He is remarkable for amplitude of mind, extent of range, and luminous beauty of thought, but is deficient in order and the power of marshalling his argument. It is true that in this treatise he follows the order of his antagonist, such as it was; still, Origen himself admits that he had changed his plan as he went on. The first book seems to have been his original conception, which was on a much smaller scale than the form which his idea took as he warmed with his subject, and consequently there is a good deal of repetition. It is so far convenient, however, that the first book furnishes an excellent *résumé* by anticipation of his general treatment of the subject. His experience as a catechist in the Alexandrine school makes his work highly practical and valuable; here and there, too, are interesting notices from his personal observation, as of the cave at Bethlehem and the cisterns of Ascalon. No book requires to be read with greater caution as to conclusions to be drawn from its silence. Many things are omitted altogether, and some barely mentioned which belonged to the very life of the Church; we may notice, as instances of the latter, his allusion to the Eucharistic banquet, and to the observance of the Christian festivals. The

vexed question of Origen's orthodoxy we have only met upon general grounds; it has been exhaustively discussed in an important treatise to which the attention of our readers was directed in an article on Origen, which appeared about twelve years ago in this REVIEW.*

ROBERT ORNSBY, M.A.

ART. IV.—ON THE ORIGIN OF THE "SOLAR MYTH,"
AND ITS BEARING ON THE HISTORY OF
ANCIENT THOUGHT.†

THE Article in the January REVIEW, on "Pre-Homeric Legends of the Voyage of the Argonauts," brought to the author of it an interesting and instructive correspondence. Several scholars, well known in the literary world, readily expressed their opinions that the "Odyssey," as we now have it, may have been more largely indebted to the "Argonautica" than has hitherto been acknowledged, or even suspected. "Your inference" (says a distinguished writer) "that the 'Argonautica' and the 'Odyssey' are both drawn independently from the old storehouse of myths, seems to me irresistible." Indeed, a clear allusion to the story of Jason, and his touching at the island of Lemnos, occurs also in a passage of the "Iliad" (vii. 469), to which a reference ought to have been given. But, while assent was in most cases accorded to this part of the argument, dissent was expressed by several writers and critics, whose opinion on the subject is certainly entitled to consideration, from the "solar" interpretation suggested of the "golden fleece." I quote here

* Professor Vincenzi's work, of which the title is: "In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio," per Aloysium Vincenzi. 4 voll. Romae, 1865." The article referred to is one of a series which appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW in the course of the year 1866. See particularly that in the October number of that year, "Origen at Cæsarea." We regret that these articles only came into our hands when just concluding the present paper.

† In presenting to the readers of this REVIEW a brief sketch of a subject in itself curious, if somewhat speculative, the writer desires to say that he has purposely avoided opening a great question, how far these myths may be corruptions of a primitive Revelation given to man when first placed as a reasoning being on the earth. The argument here pursued turns solely on the probability, or possibility, that sensuous conceptions of the phenomena of Nature gave rise to opinions and expressions, which in the course of long ages developed themselves into a system of mythology.

the words of one well-known writer on Ancient Art :—" I can see no connection between sun-worship and the solar myth. Sun-worship is natural and obvious. The sun is daily before our eyes, bestowing light and heat, contributing to the growth of animal and vegetable life ; he is the chief animating principle in Nature. But straining and twisting a plain story of human life into the counterpart of the sun's daily course in the heavens is unobvious and unnatural. What do we gain by being told that in the 'Iliad,' which is a representation of human life and character amidst struggles and difficulties—that Achilles and Agamemnon are sunbeams and shadows—that the rival hosts of Greeks and Trojans are mists and breezes, pursuing each other over an imaginary plain? What would you think, if it was said that 'Waverley,' which is another representation of human life and character, typifies the passage of the sun through clouds and mists, with occasional bursts of sunlight? This symbolical mode of treating the myth is totally inconsistent with the phase of mind of that early age; and this is, in my opinion, an insuperable difficulty. Symbolism argues a late phase of mind, and a late age." Another correspondent "thinks the argument is not very strong that the 'fleece' was the sun; and if it *was* the sun the adventurers went to explore, what (he asks) is the meaning of *finding* the fleece? Was it some great discovery in astronomy?" A fourth, approving and accepting the article as a whole, reminds me that in treating of Colchis and the sun-lands of the East, in connection with Jason, I should have referred to Herodotus (iv. 179 and vii. 193) as containing the same legends which are given by Pindar in the fourth Pythian Ode. A fifth correspondent also accepts the solar theory, and believes that the well-known story of Little Red Riding-Hood has no other origin. Thus opinions are divided ; but there seems a decided preponderance, in all the letters received, against the "solar-myth theory."

And yet the full discussion and exposition of the theory in Sir G. W. Cox's "Mythology of the Aryan Nations,"* including as it does (book ii. chap. iii.) the legend of the Golden Fleece, might have satisfied some of the objectors that no other view presents any reasonable explanation of this and similar stories.

I think the subject so very important in itself (since it is so closely allied to the earliest developments of human thought and religion), that, though it may be uninviting to some from its very novelty to them, I propose in the present Paper to return to it. Assuredly, it deserves the special attention of all who are interested in the advancement of learning and the

* In two vols. 8vo, C. Kegan Paul, 1878.

single pursuit of Truth. For, if it can be shown (for instance) that Thucydides was wrong in attributing an historical reality to Agamemnon and Theseus, and to the ten-years' war at Troy, our whole conceptions of early traditional history may demand a serious reconsideration.

Since the publication of the article in question, a distinguished scholar and Orientalist, Professor Sayce of Oxford, has been delivering a lecture at Bath* on this very subject. He is a disciple of Professor Max Müller, and with him he holds that there was a certain period in man's history, at which he had not attained to our modes of representing thought and abstract ideas, but interpreted all the impressions received by the senses as manifestations or agencies proceeding from elemental beings having personality, and therefore even sex. "Myths originate," says Professor Sayce, "in the inability of language fully to represent our thoughts, in changes of signification undergone by words as they pass through successive generations, and in the consequent misinterpretation of their meaning."

In a long and learned Paper by Professor Max Müller on "Comparative Mythology," in vol. ii. of "Chips from a German Workshop," the author takes the same view. Day and night, summer and winter, storm and thunder, he observes, are with us virtually abstract notions; yet we continue to speak of them as agents, and attribute to them, quite illogically, real action, as when we say "the day dawns," "the night approaches." Now as, in ancient language, all such words had terminations expressive of gender, it followed that each term assumed unconsciously a sexual and individual character. And what, he asks, must have been the result of this? "As long as people thought in language, it was simply impossible to speak of morning or evening, of spring and winter, without giving to these conceptions something of an individual, active, sexual, and, at last, personal character. They were either nothings, as they are nothings to our withered thought, or they were something; and then they could not be conceived as mere powers, but as beings powerful" (p. 55).

Myths, then, says Professor Sayce, "originated in the misinterpreted explanations of physical and mental phenomena furnished by primitive man." He had to explain the constitution of the world, and he personified Nature. The epithets and phrases he used were handed down to higher races, who had lost the key to their interpretation. As oral traditions, such stories were taken for what they seemed to mean; and as any such literal interpretations appeared absurd or impossible, they

* January 29, 1879.

were in time regarded as fables or inventions, and not what in their origin they really were, *imperfect descriptions of facts*. They are "the fairy-tales of the childhood of the human race;" the fictions of a simple credulity, and the expressions of perceptions purely objective, sensuous, and devoid of generalization.

The difficulty which the human mind experiences in speaking of general, collective, and abstract ideas, goes far to explain many obscurities in the subject of mythology. "If," asks Professor Müller,* "we ourselves in speaking of the sun or the storms, sleep or death, either connect no distinct idea at all with these names, or allow them to cast over our mind the fleeting shadows of the poetry of old, and invoke them as if they could hear us,—why should we wonder at the Ancients, with their language throbbing with life and revelling in colour, if, instead of the grey outlines of our modern thought, they threw out those living forms of Nature, endowed with human powers, nay, with powers more than human, inasmuch as the light of the sun was brighter than the light of a human eye, and the roaring of the storms louder than the shouts of the human voice?"†

In the age which gave birth to these myths, adds the Professor, "words were heavy and unwieldy. They said more than they ought to say, and hence much of the strangeness of the mythological language, which we can only understand by watching the natural growth of speech. Where we speak of the sun following the dawn, the ancient poets could only speak and think of the sun loving and embracing the dawn. What is with us a sunset, was to them the sun growing old, decaying, or dying. Our sunrise was to them the night giving birth to a brilliant child; and in the spring they really saw the sun or the sky embracing the earth with a warm embrace, and showering treasures into the lap of Nature."‡

A *myth*, properly so called, is altogether different from an *allegory*. In the latter, there is the conscious intention of representing actions and agents under the guise of a story which conceals their reality. But it is the essential character of a true myth that it should no longer be intelligible by a reference to the spoken language.§ A myth is a primitive expression of phenomena not scientifically understood, and by the necessities of language invested with a personal character. That personal

* "Comparative Mythology," p. 59.

† The same tendency to personify objects and to give them *sex* is shown in our calling a ship or a locomotive engine "she;" indeed, "he" and "she" are still commonly applied to the sun and the moon. Curiously enough, the Saxon *Móna* is masculine, and *Sunne* feminine.

‡ "Comparative Mythology," p. 65.

§ Ibid., p. 70.

character remained unchanged long after the ideas represented by it had undergone great developments in the human intelligence. The sun darting his rays was Apollo shooting his arrows; the sun setting in glory behind a hill was Hercules being burnt on a funeral pile on a mountain-top. In Homer and Hesiod, who, according to a strange expression of Herodotus,* "made the theogony for the Greeks," we have myths in their full-grown and even decaying state; Achilles and Odysseus, sun-gods in their origin, are merely half-human warriors. It is in the early Indian literature, the hymns of the Veda, that we find the growth of the myth.† As an example of a description of a common phenomenon passing into a tale about living agents, the author cites Endymion, who was said to have been visited by the moon on the Latmian hill, and to have slept an eternal sleep that he might always receive her nightly caresses. He shows that Endymion is from *δύω*, and means the setting sun; that the moon rising when the sun was setting was expressed in the language of myth by Selene watching Endymion; that in later ages the story was interpreted of the son of a king of Elis who was loved by a young princess. Here is a case, as all will acknowledge, where a very simple account has been developed into a history of real persons. Many curious and fantastical expansions of the same story in later ages are given at length in pp. 78-81 of the Essay we have cited. In this way the author explains as solar myths the fables in the Greek poets about Cephalos and Eos (Aurora), Cephalos and Procris (the sun and the dew), Apollo and Daphne. This word Daphne, meaning also a bay-tree, gave rise to the story of the nymph being changed into a tree. But the word really was the Sanscrit *ahan* (dahan, Ahanâ), the Greek *Athena*, and the English *dawn*.‡ Another form is *Danae*, the mythical mother of the solar hero Perseus. Now we see why (as explained in my former Paper) the "ægis" of the goddess Pallas Athena is nothing but a bright sun-cloud—the glowing garment of the morning.

Sir George Cox, in his very learned and interesting work on "The Mythology of the Aryan Nations," has pursued this subject still further. He has, indeed, analysed and brought under the same general rule all the myths and fables of antiquity, so many of which, in a slightly altered form, survive to the present day as familiar nursery tales. He points out, as Professor Max

* Lib. ii. 53.

† "Comparative Mythology," p. 76. "The Veda is the real theogony of the Aryan races, while that of Hesiod is a distorted caricature of the original image."

‡ Ibid., pp. 90-93. The name *Danae* may mean *sea*, or *water* (Danube, Don, &c.).

Müller had done, that there was an age of mythology—a period in man's history when it was the inevitable result of his imperfect attempt to express and describe the operations of Nature. "On the hypothesis of a form of thought which attributed conscious life to all physical objects, we must at once admit that the growth of a vast number of cognate legends was inevitable."* The numerous aspects assumed by the sun gave birth to as many *μῦθοι*, ways of speaking about him, which afterwards passed into legends, and became the only history which survived from those remote ages. As there was no limit to his varying aspects, so there was no limit to the varieties of description. The idea of *existence* expanded into that of *personality*. Living things became living persons; and living persons, associated with stupendous and apparently miraculous powers, were exalted into gods. Gods, in their turn, must have a locality, with various adventures and relations, actions and sufferings, passions and emotions. With deification came worship and rites of propitiation. And thus in time mythology, if not the origin of unrevealed religion, became intimately associated with it. Early Christianity, which could see in pagan mythology nothing but the worship of devils, perhaps failed to perceive, as clearly as we now do, that all religions have a great deal in common. Reverence and awe, prayer and a desire to please with a fear of displeasing, self-devotion and faith in Divine goodness and justice, are as possible with the sun-worshipper as with a believer in the true God. But the impurity and grossness attaching to the later developments of the myths not unnaturally excited the indignation of the Christian missionaries, as it had given rise first to the doubts and then to the protests of Euripides and Plato.

The development of solar myths, then, so far from being an absurdity, was a necessity of man's existence, when he could only use such language as described everything under personal attributes. It is only because the moon and the stars are obviously secondary powers in the sky that the principal source of myth was the sun. The objection, so often alleged, that "your system makes everything to be the sun," finds its answer in this consideration. The corruption of myths, solar or of any other character, and their transition into endless absurdities and indecencies, is nothing more than was to be expected. For all that, *in their origin they were not pure creations of fancy*—mere fabrications of ingenious idleness. They came into being because they had a meaning; they passed into absurdity or obscenity only because that meaning was wholly forgotten and

* Vol. i. p. 110.

unknown. It is mainly through the knowledge of Indian literature that the interpretation of these stories has become possible. "Comparative mythology," like comparative language, has become a science; and as both are new sciences, resulting from our extended knowledge of mankind and the records and monuments of his history, so we cannot wonder at, much less ought we to blame, the zeal of those who, not having this knowledge, denounced, as coming from the Father of Lies, the system which they found in its latest and most corrupt developments, and which they gave their whole energies to expose and to destroy.

One of the proofs that most of the Greek legends about the gods and heroes—Heracles, Apollo, Perseus, Theseus, Œdipus, Odysseus, &c.—are of solar origin, consists in the fact, so well pointed out by Sir George Cox,* that *essentially the same actions are attributed to them all*. They are all slayers of monsters, or powerful foes; all court or carry off or return to a bride; all grow up brave, all perform some wonderful feat; all go in quest of some lost treasure; generally, they are exposed in infancy, but survive to cause the death of their own parents (like Perseus, Œdipus, and Paris); they perform set tasks or labours; they are faithless to their first loves; they are reunited to them in the end. The simple fact, as it appears to the sense, that the sun leaves the East and yet is found there again on the very next day, was spoken of under the figure of a bridegroom torn from his bride, soon to be reunited. It is thus that Paris is separated from Helen and Oenone, Achilles from Briseis, Ulysses from Penelope. Thus, "we can see at once that Athenians, Thebans, Argives, Spartans, regarded as independent and local narrative tales which are merely modified versions of the same story. Their convictions furnish not even the faintest presumption that the actors in the great dynastic legends ever had any historical existence, or that the myths themselves point to any historical facts."†

Events and persons that seem to be historical, and have been, and even still are, commonly accepted as such, like Theseus, Achilles, and Agamemnon and the Trojan War, for the most part involve this grand difficulty, that *nearly the same accounts occur in the legends of other nations*. "If," says Sir G. Cox,‡ "all these tales have some historical foundation, they must relate to events which took place before the dispersion of the Aryan tribes from their original home. If the war at Troy took place at all, as the Homeric poets have narrated it, it is, to say

* "Aryan Mythology," book i. chap. v. p. 80. † Ibid., vol. i. p. 83.

‡ Ibid., vol. i. p. 156. Even King Arthur and his Round Table is doubtless a solar story. Compare the "golden table" in the temple of Belus in Babylon, Herod. i. 179.

the least, strange that precisely the same struggle, for precisely the same reasons, and with the same results, should have been waged in Norway and Germany, in Wales and Persia."

But, though the epic poet himself believed he was describing real heroes and their deeds, it is impossible not to acknowledge that the son of the sea-goddess and his early death, Ulysses and his long wandering in the West far from his expectant and disconsolate Penelope, must have been, in their remote origin, in lands far away from Greece or Asia Minor, *solar legends*. For almost every detail, when impartially examined, suits the changing phases of the sun, and nothing but that.* Yet we not only read repeated asseverations that the Trojan war contains at least a nucleus of true history, but we are assured that Priam's palace and Agamemnon's skeleton have been disinterred by a living explorer, who himself avows his belief in them as such.

If we only compare the story of Penelope being regarded as a still young and loving bride after her husband's absence for twenty years, with the legend of Œdipus having children by his own mother Jocasta, we shall see that these tales must belong to "that class of mythical beings whose beauty time cannot touch" ("Aryan Mythology," i. p. 222). Again, nearly the same adventures are attributed to Hercules and to Theseus. In the play of Euripides, "The Mad Hercules," these two men of valour are represented as close friends. This is the blending of two national solar heroes into one narrative. Perseus, "the destroyer," was another solar hero; his adventures do but reproduce, with variations, the same main and leading idea.

Sir George Cox confidently asserts "the absolute identity of the great mass of Hindoo, Greek, Norse, and German legends."† This one fact, if a fact it be, shows that they cannot be history; the other fact, their mythological significance and consistency, shows that neither are they idle tales and mere inventions, but *expressions of conceptions*. Again, if this is so, and they are all the product of an era in the age of mankind, that era must be a remotely ancient one, because the same tales were carried far and wide by races on their dispersion from a common centre in the East. The hypothesis of conscious borrowing is untenable, not only because it is itself unlikely (for if such tales are

* I say this with some confidence, having for years gone thoroughly into the question. What is known as "Euemerism," or the attempt to extract some truth out of legend, was a theory to which I formerly inclined; but I accept the just rebuke of Sir G. W. Cox for doing so ("Aryan Mythology," vol. i. p. 173), in a Paper contributed long ago to the *Home and Foreign Review*. I am aware, of course, that the bare statement above reads like a begging of the entire question.

† Vol. i. p. 164.

mere inventions, each nation would invent for itself), but because "it would lead us to infer an amount of intercourse between the separated Aryan tribes for which we shall vainly seek any actual evidence."* Moreover, the ideas pervading these stories are not merely similar; they are substantially identical in all their essential details and characteristics. All of them "may be placed together in one class, as springing from phrases which at first denoted physical phenomena."† They all turn upon movements between the East and the West for the recovery of some stolen treasure, or rightful inheritance; and this prize or this heritage is the bright land where the sun sinks to rest after his journey through the heaven, or the light of day carried off by the powers of darkness, and brought back again, after a hard battle, in the morning.‡

In reference to the Argonautic legend to which the former article was specially devoted, Sir George Cox entirely agrees as to its strictly solar character. I am glad to add his high authority in confirmation of my own independent researches and conclusions. "The whole mythical history of Hellas," he observes,§ "exhibits an alternation of movements from the West to the East, and from the East back to the West again, as regular as the swayings of a pendulum. In each case either something bright is taken away, and the heroes who have been robbed return with the prize which, after a long struggle, they have regained; or the heroes themselves are driven from their home eastward, and thence return to claim their rightful heritage. The first loss is that of the Golden Fleece; and the chieftains led by Jason set forth in the speaking ship on their perilous voyage to the shores of Colchis. Before the fleece can be regained there are fearful tasks to be done; but the aid of the wise Medea enables Jason to tame the fire-breathing bulls, and to turn against each other the children of the dragon's teeth. Then follows the journey homeward, in which Medea again saves them from the vengeance of Aeetes, and Jason reigns gloriously in Iolchos after his long wanderings are ended. This tale is repeated again in the story of the wrongs and woes of Helen. She, too, is stolen, like the Golden Fleece, from the western land, and carried far away towards the gates of the morning, and a second time the Achaian heroes are gathered together to avenge the disgrace, and to bring back the peerless queen whom they have lost." All these and other similar stories, the author adds, are the favourite theme of the Vedic poets. The whole *Achilleis* is a magnificent solar Epic, telling

* "Aryan Mythology," vol. i. p. 167.

† Ibid.; vol. i. p. 217.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid., vol. i. p. 204.

us of a sun rising in radiant majesty, soon hidden by the clouds, yet abiding his time of vengeance, when from the dark veil he breaks forth at last in more than his early strength, scattering the mists and kindling the ragged clouds which form his funeral pyre.*

In the childhood of mankind, the daily death of the sun was regarded as a reality. If he was born again, it was not from any astronomical necessity, so to say, but from the sufferance of nature, or of Varuna (Ὀὐρανὸς), the Sky-god, or Dyaus (Ζεὺς), or from his own benevolence to men, either of which might fail, and the casual eclipses and obscurations might become perpetual. The birth and death of the sun, his connection with the dawn, and his tremendous and victorious efforts to regain it, were the one theme and topic of regard. He was talked about (though in a different sort of language), just as we are always talking, and are never tired of talking, of "the weather." Hence it is that solar myths seem all in all. How natural this was, I hope to show by a few very striking examples.

And first let us examine briefly the stories about Tantalus and Sisyphus. Clearly, if these two persons do not represent the sun-god, the deeds and sufferings attributed to them have no intelligible point or meaning: the origin of such wild fables is quite incapable of explanation. On the other hand, if they do, every detail in the narrative becomes simple and significant. And if it can be shown, even by a single example, that the sun must be meant, then the doctrine of the solar myth is established, and we are compelled to admit that at one period of man's history such anthropomorphic ideas about the sun must have been prevalent, unconsciously perhaps, yet still embodying with a singular consistency facts and phenomena that found this particular mode of expression. In the eleventh book of the "Odyssey" (582-600) there is a short but well-known account of the punishment which Tantalus and Sisyphus had to undergo for their crimes in the other world. Tantalus stood up to his chin in the water of a lake, always making efforts to drink; but whenever he stooped his head, the water retired before him, and the dark earth appeared under his feet. Ripe juicy fruits were shed upon him by trees that grew around—apples, pears, pomegranates, and figs—but no sooner did he stretch his hand to grasp them than they were blown away by the wind.† Can any one seriously doubt that Tantalus immersed in the lake means the sun settling down into the western sea?

* "Aryan Mythology," vol. i. p. 253.

† Hence, of course, our word "to tantalise."

Mento summam aquam attingens siti enecatus Tantalus, was the description of him by an old Roman poet, probably Ennius.* The ancients speculated on the hissing and steaming caused by the red-hot orb being cooled down and extinguished in the sea.

Audiet Herculeo stridentem gurgite solem, says Juvenal.† Fire and water could not co-exist; but in this myth the sun has the mastery, and it is the water that retires before the fire. Hence Homer says it was dried up by the god to punish Tantalus, *καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων*.‡

But another story, and at first sight quite a different one, was told about Tantalus. This is given in the prologue of the "Orestes" of Euripides§ and by Pindar. As a punishment for having revealed certain divine mysteries which he had heard when invited by the gods to a celestial banquet, he was suspended in mid-air, with a huge stone hanging ever ready to fall on his head. The name *Tantalus*, like *Atlas* and *Atalante*, is derived from a root *ταλ*, meaning *endurance*. The first syllable is changed from *ταλ* to *ταν*, by a well-known law of language. The word is virtually the same as *τάλαντον*, the beam of a scale, so named from its poising and lifting weights. Thus Tantalus means "the Poiser,"—the suspender in air of the great round orb of the sun. It was a primitive idea to represent the sun and the earth as tied together by a chain. Thus Homer|| makes Zeus tauntingly invite the gods to try and pull him out of the sky by hanging with all their weight on to a long golden chain let down to the ground. And he adds, that if the same chain were fastened to Mount Olympus he would pull the whole earth along with it up into the sky. Euripides¶ makes his Electra in a monody utter the following aspiration:—"O that I could fly to that mass of rock that hangs suspended by golden chains midway between earth and sky, even the lump of earthy matter** that is borne along in eddying circles from Olympus." He may mean, by the concluding words, "in the sky," or he may refer to the apparent motion of the sun southwards after rising over the great north-eastern mountain called Olympus from the waters of the Ægean Sea. The Ionic philosopher, Anaxagoras, had asserted that the sun was not a divinity, but only a mass of luminous matter—a ball of glowing metal, *μύδρος*—and he was banished for maintaining so impious a doctrine. Of the meaning, then, of the "hanging rock" in connection with the story of Tantalus, not the slightest doubt can reasonably be entertained. And if this view is the

* Cic. Tusc. Disp., i. ch. 5, § 10.

† Sat. xiv. 280.

‡ Od. xi. 587.

§ v. 5—10. Pind. Ol. i. 57.

|| Il. viii. 19.

¶ Orest. 982.

** Lit. "the clod," *βῆλον*.

only true one, it follows that the story itself is a "solar myth." But there are other points which bring out and confirm this view still more strongly.

Tantalus, it was fabled, had enjoyed the signal honour of dining with Zeus and the other gods at a celestial banquet.* What is this, but the sun ascending from sea and earth into the upper regions of the sky? It was further fabled that he had served up to them in a "return dinner," given to them at Sipylus,† the limbs of his own son, Pelops; that one of them, Demeter or Ceres, deceived by the cunning cookery, had tasted a portion, and that poor Pelops, when restored to life by Zeus, was *minus* a shoulder. This trifling defect, however, was remedied by an artificial shoulder of ivory being substituted.

This strange and wild (or as Pindar, writing some five centuries before the Christian era, thought it, this profane) tale is explained by modern investigators to signify that the sun scorches up and as it were *cooks* the fruits and the crops produced by his warmth.‡ It may possibly refer to the apparent diminution or dismemberment of the sun himself in eclipse. Many years ago I explained this legend by suggesting that Pelops, which means "swarthy-faced," was perhaps the name of some sun-burnt wanderer from the north or north-east, who when his mantle was removed displayed a white skin underneath.§ But I think it much more probable that, like κύκλωψ "round-faced," πέλοψ, "swarthy-faced," is only an epithet of the sun obscured by clouds or mists.

But what about the banquet? it will be asked. Nothing can be more obvious.

To the Greek, the visit of a stranger meant the obligation of offering hospitality; and hospitality offered meant hospitality returned. Therefore, if Tantalus (the sun) went from earth to heaven, and back again to earth, when he appeared over Mount Sipylus, he received and gave a feast, the one in heaven the other on the earth. Thus, in the opening of the "Odyssey,"|| the poet says that Poseidon had gone to the distant Æthiopians to partake of a sacrifice and a feast; and the same is said of Zeus and the other gods in the First Book of the "Iliad" (423).

Tantalus thus offers up his own son, as Agamemnon offered up his own daughter Iphigenia, as Atreus served up to his

* Eur. Orest. 8. Pind. Ol. i. 60.

† A mountain on the west coast of Asia Minor. Pindar describes the ἀμυβαία δειπνα, rejecting the cannibal aspect of it as impious and absurd, Ol. i., *ibid.*

‡ The Roman poets frequently use *coquere* and *cactus* in this sense.

§ Dr. Donaldson adopted this explanation as "undoubtedly true" in "Varronianus," p. 448, ed. 2. || i. 22-25.

brother Thyestes the flesh of his own children,* and as Astyages did the same to Harpagus† who had offended him, and as Medea killed her children to vex their faithless father Jason. There must be some connection in these stories; probably they are all in their origin solar, and differ in nothing but the mode of expression from the story told in Hesiod of Kronos (Saturn) devouring his own offspring.‡ All things that are produced from the earth are consumed by it; that which is the womb is also the grave; a sentiment expressed over and over again by poets, ancient and modern.

Primitive men, like the low races of to-day, lived in constant fear of sorcery. They believed in witches and "wise men" who could draw the moon from the sky, and hide the sun in perpetual night. More than this, they feared that the sun might some day fall, and set the whole world on fire. This belief, that the end of all things would be a general conflagration, was very commonly held.§ It was partly suggested by the fall of meteors, partly by volcanic outbreaks, which made them fear both fire without and fire within. Some day, Tantalus himself might be hurled from the sky, torch in hand, and set the world ablaze for the sins of man! There is a remarkable passage in Sophocles,|| to which, indeed, this view gives an entirely new, and evidently the only correct, interpretation. Speaking of the Argive chief Capaneus, who was struck by a thunderbolt and hurled from the rampart just as he was about to fire the city, the poet says that "he fell on the rebounding earth with his torch in his hand, *taking the part of a Tantalus*."¶ This is tantamount to comparing his fall with that of the sun itself.

I hope I have shown that Tantalus really is a very interesting person, and that a good deal may be learnt from a right interpretation of the story. But I must dismiss him for the present, and pass on to two of his compeers in the penal under-world, Sisyphus and Ixion. We are told** that Sisyphus was seen by Ulysses in Hades pushing a huge stone up a hill, and labouring and straining with hands and feet to reach the summit. But just as the hill-top was attained, some unknown almighty power†† thrust it back, and "down to the level again bounded

* Æsch. Ag. 1590. † Herod. i. 118-9. ‡ Hes. Theog. 467.

§ It is mentioned, for instance, both by Cicero and Lucretius.

|| Antig. 134.

¶ ἄντιτύπα δ' ἐπὶ γῇ πέσε ταυταλωθείς. The participle is usually explained "he fell with a swing," or "making a sumerset." But ταυταλωθῆναι is formed like στραποῦσθαι, ταξιούσθαι, to take one's place in an army or regiment, and to be engaged or occupied in it.

** Hom. Od. xi. 593.

†† κραταῖς, *valida vis*, xi. 597.

the remorseless stone." The verses, describing first the effort of pushing and then the rapid descent, are so constructed as to imitate by their rhythm the action itself—

Striving hard to thrust, he shoved with hands and feet, but
Down to the level again rebounded the runaway rock.

This kind of verse, composed of heavy spondees, is imitated by an old poet, quoted by Cicero—*

Sisyphu' versat

Saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum.

Of this Sisyphus, as of Tantalus, another tale is told. He had returned alive from Hades, by giving the slip, like a runaway slave, to Proserpine and the keepers of the infernal prison. This is alluded to in Sophocles,† as by several other writers whom I need not quote. He was said to have been the real father of Ulysses (himself a solar hero), Laertes‡ being only his putative sire. The cause of his punishment, like that of Tantalus, was, according to one account, the crime of having revealed certain mysteries of the gods; according to another, his refusal to return to the world of spirits. How well all these accounts accord with the "solar myth" must be evident to all. The stone which he is ever rolling up-hill represents the apparent course of the sun from the horizon to the zenith and back again. His descent into, and stealthy return from, the under-world is a feat that the sun, and the sun only, could perform. Lucretius,§ taking the story as he found it, gave it an allegorical meaning which it was never intended to have, and interpreted it of the vanity of the pursuit of wealth and honours which ever slip away :—

Hoc est adverso nixantem trudere montem,
Saxum quod tamen a summo jam vortice rursum
Volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

Another solar myth is the story of Ixion, who was tortured in Hades by being bound to an ever-revolving wheel. The name *Ixion* probably means "comer" or "visitor," a very appropriate term for the sun-god.|| Similar names are *Hyperion*¶

* Tusc. Disp. i. ch. v. § 10.

† Philoct. 625. He was said to have been left unburied on earth by his own request, and to have obtained permission to return on pretence of punishing his wife for the neglect of his obsequies.

‡ A name resembling *Laius*, the father of *Cedipus*, another "sun-god" in human guise. On the supposed etymology of the word, see Appendix A in "Aryan Mythology," ii. p. 367. § iii. 1012.

|| From *ικνεῖσθαι, ἵξομαι*, though others say the word is Sanscrit.

¶ *ἵππερ* and *ἱέται*, or, perhaps, *ἵππερ*, with the termination of a noun. When the word, expressing an attribute, became a person, the patronymic *Ἵππεριονίδης* was introduced.

Endymion, and *Οὐρανίωνες* as an epithet of the gods. But in the course of time a fable was invented to suit the name, as if from *ικέτης*, "a suppliant," that Ixion had come to beg of Jupiter expiation from the guilt of a murder, and being honoured with an interview with the supreme god had become enamoured of the goddess Hera. He is called by ancient poets "the first suppliant."* Jupiter, the story says, so far encouraged or allowed his addresses to Hera (a mythical way of expressing the sun wooing the air) that he gave him for a wife a wraith or phantom (*εἶδωλον*) made of a cloud, from which a Centaur was born as offspring,† but as a punishment for his presumption he was fastened to a four-spoked wheel in the lower world. "I have heard," says the chorus in the "Philoctetes" of Sophocles,‡ "in story, though I have never seen it, that the impious intruders on the bed of Zeus were put on the revolving wheel by the almighty son of Cronus." Pindar gives the narrative as an allegory,§ or moral lesson, to illustrate the fitting reward of ingratitude. None of these very ancient writers seem in the least conscious what the real origin and meaning was of the stories they are relating. Pindar evidently had no notion that Ixion's wheel was the round sun.|| He says he had to undergo this torture for two sins, both as the perpetrator of the first murder by treacherous means, and also as having aspired to the hand of the goddess Juno.

The apparent union of earth and sky, by the supposed contact of the horizon, gave rise to many natural and not unreasonable beliefs. One curious idea was that the heaven was a great brazen vault dipping into the circling ocean that formed the border of the round flat world, and was prevented from sinking therein by being upheld by the giant Atlas. The gods, it was thought, could descend from the welkin and visit the earth, just as the sun himself was seen to do bodily. Alcinous, the Phæacian king, tells Ulysses that in his happy island the gods have been wont to appear visibly, and take a part with the people in the feasts and sacrifices instituted in their honour. The Phæacians themselves are called *ἀγχιθῆοι*, "near to the gods."¶ The sky, in fact, was a high road—a steep one, no

* Æschylus, *Eumen.* 419, 688.

† Hera (Juno) was herself the air. The monster Centaur, like the rocks thrown at Ulysses by the Cyclops, represents the strange forms which cumuli-clouds assume in the sky, and are often "very like a camel."

‡ v. 676.

§ *Pyth.* ii. 21, *seqq.*

|| "The wheel of Ixion can never rest, any more than the sun can pause in his daily career. The legend is almost transparent throughout" ("Aryan Mythology," i. p. 226).

¶ See *Hom. Od.* v. 35, vii. 201.

doubt, but the gods could do everything—between heaven and earth. There was, it was supposed, some far-off region where the vault of heaven closed in the round world as with a wall. Lighted up by sunrise and sunset, the *flammanitia mœnia mundi** were real barriers, beyond which no mortal could go, and behind which Atlas or the Titans or some mighty elemental beings were supposed to have their residence. So far sailors could go in unexplored seas, but no farther: that barrier of cloud and mist and Cimmerian darkness was the limit set to the enterprise of mortal man.† The appearance on earth of a god (the sun-god especially) for a certain period began to be regarded as an "avatar," or the assuming of a human form for the purpose of dwelling among men. Thus it was fabled that Apollo had tended the flocks and herds‡ of Laomedon, king of Troy, and of Admetus, king of Thessaly, in the capacity of a slave, or herdsman, for hire. Clearly, the visits of the sun to earth are thus described; it is another "solar myth." A similar notion is embodied in the descent of Iris down the rainbow to bring messages from the gods to man. Milton, the most classic of poets, has introduced the idea in his beautiful "Ode to the Nativity"—

But He, her fears to cease,
Sent down the meek-eyed Peace;
She, crown'd with olive green, came softly sliding
Down through the turning sphere,
His ready harbinger,
With turtle wing his amorous clouds dividing;
And waving wide her myrtle wand,
She strikes a universal peace through sea and land.

Few, perhaps, who gaze at the bright hues of the flower so familiar under this name are aware that the word really means "Speaker."§ The rainbow itself was identified with the airy

* Lucretius, i. 67.

† Eurip. Hippol. 745.

‡ "Iliad," xxi. 443; Eur. Alcest. 6—8. Nothing is so common in Aryan mythology as the mention of *cows* or *oxen* in connection with the sun. They seem to represent bright forms that appear to go forth, in the form of luminous fleeting clouds, from the home of the sun in the east. The stealing and recovery, or the killing of these oxen, is the subject of many of the tales in the early Greek legends.

§ Sir G. W. Cox ("Aryan Mythology," i. p. 366) seems to say that the meaning of the name is unknown. The word takes the digamma in Homer—i.e., it was pronounced "Wiris." The root is the same as in *ἐπεῖν* and *ἐπέσθαι*. Thus the beggar *Iris*, in Od. xviii. 6, is said by the poet to have been so called "because he used to go and carry messages whithersoever any one ordered him." An amusing satire on the notion of a messenger-goddess, with a somewhat undignified treatment of the painted lady, may be read in the "Birds" of Aristophanes, v. 1200, *seqq.*

form that was believed to descend and ascend by that heavenly arch. From the red hues that it displayed, it was associated with the idea of wars and blood, as the Aurora Borealis or a comet has often been, even among people who ought to know better.* This involved the notion of truce, and of the intervention of a messenger between the gods and men, to propose and discuss the terms of it.

One of the most favourite and at the same time most natural and appropriate personifications of the sun, was as a far-shooting and never-failing archer. So Apollo, Hercules,† Odysseus; so the moon-goddess and huntress Artemis, Io "the shooter,"‡ were always represented as armed with and skilful in the use of the bow; so the arrows of Hercules, inherited by Philoctetes, were ἀφυκποι, always fatal.§ Sudden deaths by sun-stroke are attributed to the vengeful arrows of the god or the goddess, according to the sex of the person struck by them.

It is very difficult to persuade any one to listen with patience and impartiality to the arguments which tend to show that the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey" are "solar myths." It is thought a kind of sacrilege, by those many persons who prefer sentiment to truth, to "explain away" all the chivalry and the heroism of those great poems, and to divest them of every particle of history. They do not sufficiently see that the Greek poet is but dressing up after his own conception (which undoubtedly was that of real and historical persons) very ancient traditions that he was introducing to his countrymen, in entire ignorance of their origin and true meaning. At the present day, from our extended knowledge of Indian literature, we can interpret this meaning, though "Homer" himself knew it not.

Those who impartially consider the plan of the two great Homeric epics will find the arguments for their solar origin are extremely strong. Here we have Thetis, the sea, marrying Peleus (πηλὸς meaning, like *tellus*, τέλλος and τέλμα "wet earth"). From the union is born Achilles, who is the sun springing out of the sea. The prayer of Thetis to Zeus, to do honour to her son, on which much of the action of the "Iliad" turns, is the

* See "Iliad," xi. 27.

† The club of Hercules is much later in art than the accoutrement of the bow.

‡ Connected perhaps with *ἰέαι*. Some scholars hold that this name, in common with Ἰόλη, Ἰοκάστη, Ἰάμος, Ἰῶνες, refers to the violet-coloured clouds in the purple east; and thus, they observe, Φοῖνιξ is represented as the guardian and tutor of Achilles.

§ Soph. Phil. 105.

ascent of the sun-god to heaven. The might, the invincible prowess, the unwearied strength of the hero, and his powers of destruction and devastation—nay, even his divinely-made shield—are merely attributes of the sun in his midday splendour. Similarly Ulysses, *Odysseus*, is the setting sun.* He has wandered away far into the western seas, and he is detained there by monsters and sorcerers, while his heart's desire is to get back to his home in the East. He descends alive into the under-world, and he returns from it. He kills the monsters that oppose and delay the repossession of his rights, and he regains his palace and his ever-young bride; it is the sun reunited to Aurora. The Cyclops, whose eye he puts out, is himself the sun vanishing by storm-clouds or eclipses from the sky. The palace of Alcinous, glowing with colours, is the bright sun-set; the ships that sail as automata, and convey Ulysses from Phæacia to Ithaca, are the clouds that escort and accompany the sun in his career (Od. viii. 558). All this is really plain, though the author of the poem shows not the slightest consciousness of any such meaning. To *him* all the heroes are real characters, and all the countries and islands traversed have a real geographical existence. Dr. Schliemann himself has not a firmer belief in the historical character of Priam, whose palace he believes he has found! And yet even Priam was very nearly related to a "sun-god;" for he was brother to old Tithonus, who was fabled to have taken the young Aurora as his bride!†

Penelope's "web," which the suitors found her weaving in the day, while she unravelled it at night, is but the cloud-tissue of dissolving mist.

To many, these and similar explanations appear as farfetched, as to others they appear obvious and natural. We must not hope to make all persons see all things with the same eyes. Objectors say, "You make everything and everybody mean the sun." Is it nothing, that so large a portion of ancient mythology, on this theory alone, admits of one consistent interpretation—one that makes sense out of nonsense, and supplies a motive, of all others the most probable, for the composition of such stories? There was undoubtedly a period in man's history when "everything was the sun," because the sun was everything to everybody. It was the one centre of all his

* Like *Endymion*, the name contains the root of δύνειν or δύεσθαι, "to set."

† The name of Priam's queen, *Hecuba*, Ἑκάβα, "the far-goer," is significant. Compare ἑκατηβόλος and Ἑκάτη as applied to the sun and moon. On the "historical value of Homer," as maintained by Mr. Gladstone and others, see Appendix B, in vol. ii. of "Aryan Mythology."

thoughts, worship, hopes, and aspirations. It was his god, and as a living, moving, and conscious agent, alike powerful for good or for harm, the giver alike of life and death, health and sickness, famine and plenty, fertility and drought, he was the theme of all their varied powers of description. Races there were, which knew of nothing else that governed the world, or which gave light and withdrew it: they venerated the sun while they feared it; they prayed to it, worshipped it, sacrificed to it, and propitiated it. We are entitled to accept reasonings on any subject which are based upon assumptions that will account for all the phenomena. This, in fact, is the ground of all astronomical and geological science. We accept as certain, and even as demonstrated facts, such inferences as entirely fall in with all that we see, and are sufficient to explain it. It is no doubt true that solar myths are incapable of being reduced to the same degree of certitude; nevertheless, the nature of the proof is the same. We conclude that boulders, scattered for hundreds of miles over the country, were conveyed by glaciers, because no known force except ice could deposit them under the same conditions. We conclude that Ixion's wheel and Sisyphus' stone meant the sun, because nothing will account for the invention and acceptance of either story if it was a mere idle figment.

It may be objected, why do most of these tales turn on crimes and their punishment in the other world? Are they not, for that very reason, mere creations of imagination acted on by the instinctive fear of the Unseen? The answer, again, is obvious. The withdrawal of the light of the sun was attributed to the passage of the sun-god under the world. The ideas of Elysium, of light vouchsafed to blessed spirits, and of the darkness of the damned, were inseparable from such physical reasonings. And the notion of offending the sun-god by sins of omission or commission gave rise to superstitious fears, depicting the penalty attaching to them in another state of existence. The descent from a higher to a lower grade of existence is inseparable from the notion of something done to deserve the degradation. The sun detained in the regions below was the sun in a state of servitude and subjection.

A curious but well-known characteristic of solar myths is the identification of the sun both with the agent or patient, and with the thing or object on or by which the act is exercised. Ixion is the sun, and so is Ixion's wheel. Tantalus is the culprit who fears the fall of the rock, and the rock itself. Ulysses is the setting sun, who puts out the eye of day by blinding the Cyclops. Hercules is the sun, who expires in flame on the summit of Mount Ceta; but the fiery robe which scorched him to death

is the sun-cloud.* Now this, so far from being an objection to the theory, goes far to confirm it. It is the unconscious blending of two modes of representation—the sun as a person, and the sun as a thing. To construct a story, there must be both agents and subject-matter for action; and both, from different points of view, may be the same; Tantalus is the same as the rock which hangs over him, and Ixion is neither more nor less than his own wheel.

The numerous legends of adventurous heroes who descended alive into Hades in quest of some lost friend, or, like Hercules, to bring back to earth a denizen of the infernal world, such as the dog Cerberus, can only refer to the sinking of the sun below the horizon, and his return in the East. Here, again, we notice the characteristic just explained; the sun goes in search of himself. Orpheus goes to fetch his wife Eurydice, Theseus to recover his friend Peirithous, Ulysses to consult the ghost of Teiresias (by a process differing in nothing from the revived superstition of "spirit-rapping") about his absent wife; the goddess Ceres to find her daughter Proserpine, who had been carried off as a bride to Pluto. The name *Odysseus* probably contains the root of *δύναι*, "to set;" yet so unconscious was the author of the "Odyssey" of this meaning, that he refers it to *ὀδύσασθαι*, "to be wrathful," on account of the anger of Poseidon against Ulysses for killing the Cyclops.

I have no desire to press any theory too far, or advocate any non-natural interpretation. But there is a remarkable similarity in the stories told about *Œdipus*, Theseus, and Amphiaræus, that points not obscurely to the same solar origin. The mysterious disappearance of these men under the earth—their supposed existence as *δαίμονες* or hero-spirits, and the cult or worship paid to their tombs,† impart a colouring more than human to their fate. The wierd summons to *Œdipus* in the grove of the Dread Goddesses at Colonus‡—the awful voice that was heard to call *Œdipus*—*Œdipus, why tarry we? All too long we have been waiting for you*,—above all, the marriage with Jocasta—the unconscious union with her from whom he had himself been born—the new sun produced from

* I will just remark here, as a curious circumstance, that an expression in the "Trachiniæ" of Sophocles (v. 831), which it is difficult otherwise to explain—viz., the calling the fatal garment, smeared with the poisonous blood of the Centaur, *φονία νεφέλα*, "a gory cloud," may indicate some more conscious treatment of the subject in ancient tradition. Red clouds (as above remarked) have often been supposed to portend wars.

† "Audisne hæc, Amphiaræe sub terram abdite?" says an old poet cited by Cicero, Tusc. Disp. ii. ch. 25, § 60.

‡ Soph. Œd. Col. 1627.

the old sun, at once parent and child,—these are all legends of the same kind. The old man suddenly vanishes—no one knows how or where. He is at once alive and dead, extinguished and recreated, perishable and eternal; a denizen of the underworld and the upper-world.

There is a well-known legend, the subject of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, which is generally allowed, I believe, to be "solar." That cunning god, the patron of rogues and thieves of every description—the *Mercurius* of the Romans—is said to have stolen and driven off a herd of cows while yet an infant. To prevent the theft being discovered by the traces of the animals, he fixed bundles of brushwood to their feet, so that none could tell the direction they had taken.* Now these cows are the clouds; the "oxen of the sun" which figure so conspicuously in the "Odyssey." It is a question of interest, whether the Roman legend of the fire-breathing monster and robber Cacus, who stole the oxen of Hercules (the sun-god) on his return from the West, is not in its origin identical.† The story is told by Virgil, Propertius, and Ovid, and a very good and "sensational" story it is. It was said that one of the cows confined in the cave suddenly lowed, and led Hercules to the spot, where he killed the robber and released the herd. The return of the lost sun after a thunderstorm explains the whole story very simply. The fire-breathing Cacus is the lightning, and the voice of the cow is the muttering of the thunder.

To those who have never considered the subject, many, perhaps all, of the above explanations will appear farfetched, if not absurd or even impossible. That is really no argument against them. It is the hackneyed objection so often raised against conclusions that do not fall in with preconceived opinions on literary subjects. The doctrine of solar myths must be studied as a whole, and the probability that such stories are in no cases mere idle inventions, but rather the creed of a very primitive age, will more clearly appear. Nothing is more shallow than the rejection of a theory, in itself, adequate to account for so large and important a part of ancient literature, merely because it seems strange to us. All that the advocates of the theory ask is a fair hearing. They see no reason whatever to reject it simply because "it makes everything to be the sun." That is precisely what it ought to do.

* Hom. Hymn. ad Herm. v. 80.

† I formerly interpreted this of a pre-historic tradition of some volcanic outbreak or *solfatara* in the neighbourhood of Rome. But I now believe it is as hopeless to extract history out of myth, as sunbeams out of cucumbers. See "Aryan Mythology," vol. ii. pp. 337-41, on the story of Cacus—meaning, perhaps, *Caecus*, "the blind or eyeless being."

Sir G. W. Cox has been charged by some with resolving *all* mythology into the solar myth. But his real object, in his work on the Aryan Mythology, was to show that myths grew up out of phrases applied, in the simplicity of primitive description, to elemental phenomena of all kinds, the principal and most prominent and constant of which were, of course, those of the sun. These notions therefore of the living and moving sun-god may truly be said to ramify into almost every legend of antiquity.

The mere charge of monotony—the constant “harping upon one string”—which the opponents of the solar myth allege as an objection is, as Sir George Cox observes,* equally true of the life of man, and in the dull record of birth and death, of pain and toil, prosperity alternating with adversity. Far more strange, he adds, than the preservation of so many varied stories about the sun, would have been the absence of them from an age and a clime when hardly anything else could have been the theme of popular stories.

F. A. PALEY.

ART. V.—BRITTANY AND THE BRETONS.

1. *La Bretagne Contemporaine*. HENRI CHARPENTIER, imprimeur-éditeur. Paris. 1865.
2. *Barzas Breiz, Chants populaires de la Bretagne*. Par H. DE LA VILLEMARQUÉ. Paris: Delloye. 1859.
3. *Telen Arvor — Furnez Breiz*. Par BIRIZEUX. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, éd. de 1874.

A PROVINCE three centuries behind the rest of the world; a national life that is a remnant of the Dark Ages; a peasantry eminently unprogressive, coarse, ignorant, and superstitious, having the one trifling merit of a picturesque and attractive quaintness in costume and customs; some prosperity, but only in certain parts of the country; a vast amount of misery hidden away in the towns. Fortunately, there is hope that modern progress may do its work even here. The two eastern departments, lying nearest the civilised nineteenth-century world, are almost entirely changed, and have to a great extent given up their unpractical notions, political as well as religious, ideas as antiquated as the costumes that they swept away to the stage and the studio. Even the three western

* Vol. i. p. 207.

departments are slowly casting off their old-world dulness and superstition, but it will take some time yet for the good heaven to work through such a mass of contented ignorance. This is the world's view of the question, modified, perhaps, by some sympathy with a country whose natural beauties and simple people have supplied enjoyment for its summer tourists.

A province that has kept its old traditions even in this age of novelty, its old Faith in these unfaithful days; a national life through which still shines the true light, brought to those shores in the early centuries by a hardy Christian race with its crowd of exiled saints; a peasantry that, however wanting in the world's wisdom, has at least wisdom enough to brave its ridicule by standing loyal, unambitious, devoted, not to greed of gain but to home and altar. Unfortunately, it is true that in the east the teaching of so-called modern progress has withdrawn the people from the venerable guidance of the Faith of the Ages, and the principles of '89 have sapped the spirit of loyalty; but westward lies the old province itself, far, indeed, from being all that once it was, but still a stronghold of the Faith, the home of a home-loving race, regarded by them not as a province, a part of the greater country, but as being in itself their own *petite patrie*. Here is a second view directly opposite to the first, yet the subject of both is the same—Brittany and the Bretons. It is easy to account for the difference; one looks to the material and prominent, the other values more the hidden and spiritual. At the same time, those who judge by the higher and truer standard do not call Brittany an Arcadia for this world, or an Eden for the next. Its people are not faultless—where is the race that is? But they are nobly struggling to preserve their religion, their language, their nationality, all that is summed up in their own word *Eur feiz, eur iez, eur galon!*—one Faith, one tongue, one heart. To be truly Breton still means to be truly Catholic; and loyalty to the "*petite patrie*" goes hand in hand with fidelity to the Church.

The world may say that fidelity in this case is nothing better than servitude, that it has kept them far behind the times, poor and ignorant. We answer, their Faith may have taught them that, as the Breton Song of the Bride says, "All vain honours pass like the flowers;" it may have taken away the thirst for better fortune in this life, by giving them the strong and living hope of an eternity where the black daily bread of these years, the goat-skin cloak against the cold, the thatched roof, the patient monotony of toil, will be as bygone as a dream. But while it may have acted in some degree as a curb to ambition, sparing them

thereby much restlessness and repining, it is unjust to ascribe to it the fault, wherever we have to regret their want of enterprise in agriculture or trade; nor is their want of enterprise and progress entirely either an evil or a fault. Those who speak of slavery to the religion of the Dark Ages forget that unprejudiced minds know of three causes which go far towards accounting for the unprogressive character of the Bretons. First, there is the bias of the national mind itself; second, the position and character of their country, which, remote and shut in, was until comparatively late years almost forgotten and untrodden; third, their origin and history, alone quite sufficient to account for their being different in every way from their neighbours of the rest of France, keeping jealousy aloof from them, and holding fast their own old customs and traditions. Moreover, the question may well be asked, What would they have become were they not religious? What would the Bretons be to-day had they dwelt thus aloof, but without those instincts of piety, which are now their second nature? Strangers, travelling amongst them in an honest and not a captious, critical spirit, find much to admire, almost to envy, in Catholic Brittany. What they regret lies outside the sphere of religious influence; what they condemn arises not from excess of simple piety, but from forgetfulness or abuse of it. Wherever there may be local superstitions or social defects, the need is of more piety, not of less. It is as unjust to set down all this to religion and the *curés* as to charge the royalist cause and the bands of loyal peasants with the blood-stained excesses of the *chouannerie*.

Artist, student, antiquary, and pleasure-led wanderer, all are fascinated by that old-world land; but grim philosophers and wise men of social science know better, and have stern things to say about superstition, ignorance, and unprogressive poverty. Every true description of the province is a refutation of this triple charge. Here we can only hope to indicate where the answer lies, just as in a rapid sketch a few rough pencil strokes suggest the form and colour, which every finer touch of detail would make more clear, and which a complete and finished picture would fully express.

Emile Souvestre set before him the task of giving such a finished picture, but he had the dust of anti-clericalism in his eyes and on his pencil, and the result was a good deal of exaggeration and false colour. *Les Derniers Bretons* is as misleading in the text as in the title. It is a fine poem in prose, and, dating from more than forty years ago, it is now less than ever a true representation of Brittany; but his carefully collected hoard of curious beliefs, customs, and anecdotes

still illustrates the character of the people. About the time of its publication there had begun in Paris, with Le Gonidec and Brizeux, what may be called the Breton renaissance. The great *savant* and grammarian, when he was fêted on his arrival in the capital in 1834, found there a whole colony of Bretons, who were afterwards to become distinguished in literature, and who now with the true instinct of the race clung jealously together by evening meetings and reunions in a street near Montmartre. Amongst these, and soon high in the favour of Le Gonidec, was the young Auguste Brizeux, the poet of Brittany. During the next twenty years a succession of writers told each his own tale of the old province, but foremost in the work will always stand those two widely-different names, Le Gonidec and Brizeux. The one astonished the world of learning by showing in his Breton grammar and dictionary that the language, called obselete and dead, was living and rich; the other, the poet, and in the Breton tongue the pupil of Le Gonidec, sang of his own land till Paris associated in one admiration the Breton and the country of his love. He struck the key-note in *Marie*, he out-poured all the harmony of his heart in *Les Bretons*. He gathered the traditional thoughts and feelings of his race into the songs of *Telen Arvor*, the "Harp of Armorica," and brought together and translated into French their fireside wisdom and popular sayings in *Furnez Breiz*. No sketch, however short, should part the name of Auguste Brizeux from that of Brittany. Another worthy name in the bringing to light of the remote province is that of M. de la Villemarqué. It was his work to tell the history of the Breton tongue, to collect the *Barzas Breiz*, the songs sung by generations of its people, to publish for the nineteenth century its ancient legends, its mystery plays of the Middle Ages, the poetry of its cloisters. He was the only man who could have so exquisitely moulded the epilogue on *La Poésie Bretonne*, which closes the *Bretagne Contemporaine* edited by M. Charpentier. This last work is the latest and grandest outcome of Breton patriotism. Though the three large folios, an *édition de luxe* on a huge scale, are published at Paris, every part of them, even to the paper and the printer's types, comes from the province itself. As we turn over the leaves, the full-page lithographs seem to be innumerable; every one is from sketches on the spot by a Breton artist, graven afterwards on the stone by Breton hands. The letterpress, taking each of the five departments in turn, is the work of writers who know well the past and present of their own land. They do not deal in long florid descriptions, nor do they lower a single page to the level of a tourist's guide. They attend to their one simple task of record-

ing the history and present state of every part of the province, describing briefly what is most noteworthy in the towns. A few pages of history begin the first volume, a few more of epilogue end the last, completing a perfect chronicle of the province, an unimpassioned tribute of praise, a national work destined to be enduring. Such a plan of treating the subject is too vast and too detailed even to guide us here. Our sketch can only deal broadly with three points—the country, its people, the influence of religion on their lives—but our few pencil strokes have to suggest the same Brittany, the length and breadth of which is depicted, as a slow labour of love, in *La Bretagne Contemporaine*.

First, as to the land itself, its strongly-marked features make it easily form in the mind something between a map and a picture. The peninsula strikes out into the Atlantic, its eastern end having, at the juncture with the rest of France, on the one side the coast of Normandy leaving the tide-washed sands of St. Michael at the angle, and turning northward soon to approach the Channel Islands; at the other side, below the Loire, the long southward-sweeping coast of old Poitou, the first department there beyond the boundary of the province being the Vendée of La Rochejaquelein. Two chains of mountains, or rather of high bare hills, run parallel in the north, not skirting the coast, but keeping inland, the more southern lying almost along the centre of the province. As the position of these mountains would suggest, the land has a general slope from the rugged north down to the undulating plains and low-lying sandy shores of the south; and the coast line is granite-built along most of the north, and in the extreme west, where Finistère thrusts oceanward its two great rocky promontories against wave and tempest. At the south the rocks are fewer; there are no long granite out-works against the sea, but level sand, low islets and foamy reefs; and there we find the coast receding from the water, and formy its small part of the long inward-sweeping curve where the great Bay has scooped out the west of the continent. Though Brittany is not now what it was in Chateaubriand's day, his words are still the best description of its southern *landes*, where he says that "a traveller on foot might journey for days without seeing anything but wild heaths and sandy shores, and a sea whitening against a multitude of reefs—a desolate region, dreary and stormy, with brooding fogs or lowering clouds; where the noise of the wind and of the waves is eternal." Nor are these the only uncultured districts. Heath and moor alternate with the rich and smiling valleys, and higher, in the mountain regions, there are roads that wind for miles through purple wastes of heather and

bramble, or an all but endless wilderness of dry earth and gold-tipped broom. But down between the spurs of the hills, where the shallow streams of summer become in the wet season broad and swift floods, there are tracts of green country, where the thatched houses, village churches of granite, and white gleaming crosses, look out across pasture lands, or from bowers of round billowy trees and orchards white with bloom. A great part of the south, but still more of the north, the old country of Léon and Tréguier, is as beautiful in green and luxuriant abundance as are the hills and heaths in barrenness. There the land is tilled and the seed strewn in the furrows by men who know that the harvest ripens and the mill-wheel turns for their own cottage homesteads. The sickles are swung by neighbours' arms in "white straw month;" and earlier in the year the brown hands of men and women, who have grown up together, leave only broken earth in the potato-fields, where seas of lilac blossom shone but lately beyond the hedges. Those hedges tell us at once that we are in sunny France, though in its wildest part. Their hawthorn, red and white, that in summer scents the deep-rutted roads, is festooned with an abundance of long-tangled sprays of sweeter honeysuckle. In the meadows the succession of the months bring forth a wild harvest of flowers—fresh lavender and pale starry primroses (the Breton children's "milk-flowers"), and then the briar-roses and the wild hop covering waste corners and warm hillsides with trailing wreaths. As for that part of the east of Finistère spreading in towards the high land, and once the See of St. Pol de Léon, it may be called the garden of Brittany; and its land teeming with luxuriance, and its roads covered with crosses, shrines, and chapels, prompted Émile Souvestre to declare that it seemed as if its holiness brought the blessing of fruitfulness; "one can see, by only looking at it, that it is a favoured land beloved by the saints of Paradise."

There is yet another feature of the province, its fisheries on the long northern and broken western coast. Once the wreckers of Finistère plied a remorseless trade with craft driven in by the Atlantic storms, or lured to destruction by false beacons; but now, though like all coast dwellers they make use of chance wreckage when they can, the bad old times have passed away for them as for our own men of Cornwall, and no less than twenty-eight lighthouses glimmer at night from all the points jutting furthest from the treacherous shore-line. The fishermen of Côtes du Nord, once known as the diocese of Tréguier, leave behind them bright and pleasant shores, when they put out towards the great island group that lies far off between them and the narrowing channel. Their homes are at the head of

the bays, busy villages of clustering red houses, with the slated roof and spire of the church, and perhaps the flag of the coast-guard station rising above them. Out between those creeks and bays run massive piles of red granite, towering over the waves that surge against their bases, or, as they have been well described, lying "like so many sphynxes crouched amid the foam of the sea." A modern painter has of late years made English eyes wonder incredulously at his glimpses of other coasts of the same character as this—shores marvellous in their union of bold and magnificent form, with strong sunshine and glowing colour, where the scarped and worn rocks have a radiance of their own, and the waters that wash them are full of opalescent light.

In Brittany, to a singular degree, the features of the mother-country seem to be reflected in the character of the people. Brave by nature, staunch and loyal, they bear some likeness to the unyielding granite coasts that for centuries have held their own against the waves. Loving peace, content with simple goods, happy when the fields bring forth plenty, and resigned when the rain ruins the harvest, they have some resemblance to their own valleys—bright and peaceful, with many a cross and group of Calvary pillars looking upward, while the soil awaits the will of the Heaven that blesses it. Earnest and thoughtful, with a touch of melancholy even in their festivities and in their songs, they remind one of their own memory-haunted moors, wind-swept and cloud-covered, and strewn with *dolmens* and *menhirs* of a forgotten past.

The home of this Breton race is not actually, and never was, the whole of that tract of country which is known as Brittany. The province is usually described as being divided, since 1790, into five departments—to the east, Loire Inférieure and Ille et Vilaine; farther west, almost equally dividing the peninsula, Côtes du Nord, where its name indicates, and Morbihan, with its wild *landes*, stretching from the south coast to meet it at a boundary marked by the mountains; lastly, Finistère, all the extreme west of the peninsula. Now, of these five departments only three are really Breton, and a part of the two others. Loire Inférieure was to a great extent French from the earliest times, and is almost thoroughly so at the present day, if we except the Guérande peninsula lying next to Morbihan. As for the district called after its two rivers Ille et Vilaine, the old costumes and provincial life are to be found only in a few spots along its coast, its Breton part being the west, which once was included in the diocese of Tréguier. It is a curious proof of the religious character of the people that the four old Breton Sees, S. Pol de Léon, Cornouaille, Tréguier, and Vannes, still indicate the best

division of the province, excluding as they do the French part of the two eastern departments, and separating the people not by new and arbitrary boundaries, but according to characteristics and customs which have grown up with time. So firmly does tradition bind this race, that the inhabitants of each of the four old divisions are still distinguished by certain peculiarities of dialect, costumes, and usages. Still amongst themselves they preserve the old names, and talk of the men of Léon, of Tréguier, of Vannes, or the *Kernévotes* of the south-west. They have yet a popular rhyme which in its rough satire makes the four races among themselves as distinct as any of the three beyond the Channel. "Here," it runs, "is a good old saying—

"Vain and light as a Frenchman,
Hard and wicked as an Englishman,
Proud as a Scotchman,
Stupid as a Vannetais (Morbihan),
Rough as a Cornouaillais,
Thievish as a Léonnais,
False as a Trégornais."

It is hard to decide from what region this "good old saying" could first have come; but there is only too much reason to fear that all four agree in at least one of its lines, and have some sort of lurking suspicion of the nationality commonly called "Jean l'Anglais." At the same time it should not be forgotten that our friends across the Channel have a still better old saying, and perhaps believe in it more: "Good horses of every colour; good people in every country."*

Beside differences of dialect and habits, there are marked peculiarities of costume in the various parts of the province. For instance, in the Guérande, and in some parts of Morbihan and southern Finistère, it has all the gaiety and colour of the conventional peasant-dress of romance. The men wear broad-leaved hats, the brim turned up at one side, being set at a different angle if the wearer be a young man, or if he be married, or if a widower. The coats are covered in front with braiding, and the white or black gaiters are embroidered, or else long red stockings are tied with ribbon at the knee. In the north of Finistère the style of dress is entirely different. The Léonnais gathers his coarse and dark loose coat under a belt of red or blue; and the women, instead of the infinite variety of the rest of the north and most of the south, wear simple black and white, which in widowhood they exchange for blue. The head-dress of the *Bretonne* has no form that can be called characteristic of the province, because it is to be found in each dis-

* A béb liou marc'h mât, a béb vrô tâb vât.

strict in countless shapes, displaying every degree of taste, from that of the girl who goes wearing a tower of lace and muslin to the *pardon* of St. Anne d'Auray, down to that of the woman of Guérande, who is content to tie a close cap round her face, or swathe her head like a mummy. But in the appearance of the men there is one peculiarity to be found over the whole of Brittany; it is the wearing of the hair long, hanging in wild, scant locks, or loose *boucles* to the shoulder. In our days, whether wrapped in the national *blouse* and toiling in the fields, or in holiday attire thronging the road of a pilgrimage, they are still to be seen keeping the distinctive mark of what was once the long-haired warrior race.

The language, which is still spoken over most of the west, except in the large towns, is a Celtic tongue like Welsh and Gaelic. So great, indeed, is its similarity to Welsh, that the people of both countries can make themselves understood, as if speaking two very different dialects; and the sailors of Breton colliers sometimes converse with their distant cousins on the quays of Cardiff by using their native language, for which the only substitute they know, French, would in that case be unintelligible. The peculiarities of the Breton tongue make it an inviting subject for students, who find in the depth of its Celtic nature a trace of alliance to Sanscrit in the softening and entire changing of most of its consonants when they are placed after certain others. This peculiarity is not so well preserved in any other modern language. The native lips make the changes naturally, but they surprise and mystify the stranger almost at every second word.*

Just as the language of the people tells their origin, the ruins and remains scattered over the land tell their history. Druidic circles abound, huge upright *peulvans*, and still greater solitary *menhirs*. Trehorentec is "the garden of tombs," the plain of Lanvaux is strewn with more than a hundred stones; above all, Carnac carries us back into a depth of antiquity and mystery, where no light from our days can reach. It is no wonder that the peasant of Morbihan, passing under the shadow of those giants of Carnac, is filled with an instinctive dread, and hears the souls of the dead wandering in the wind; and that superstition haunts the plain. There was once a weird story that he who passed by Carnac Church at midnight would see the windows lighted up, for within Death in surplice and stole was preaching to the crowd of skeletons that for the hour

* See the popular saying quoted in a former note, where *mâd* and *vâd* both mean *good*, but the *m* has been softened to *v*. The consonants that change are *b* to *v*, *d* to *g*, *k* to *z*, *gw* to *v*, *m* to *v*, *p* to *b*, *t* to *d*, and *s* to *z*.

had left the Churchyard empty. It is pleasanter to hear the legend of St. Cornelius explaining that the eleven long lines of upright stones at Carnac were once soldiers in hot pursuit of the saint, until he, finding himself near the sea, stopped them effectually by a stupendous miracle. No doubt the country folks who tell such a tale have a shrewd idea that it was never more than an odd fancy, but it corresponds strangely enough with a late theory that those long orderly ranks of towering stones stretching across the plain were set up as a military monument commemorative of an army. Modern engineering works have altered and swept away some of the lesser remains in Brittany; and unexplained causes have been at work with time to lay others low, like the wonder of Locmariaker, the monolith sixty feet high, which now lies in the dust. It was to this land, where a pagan worship was carried on in wilderness and forest by scattered tribes, that in the fifth and sixth centuries came the forefathers of the Bretons. As we are told by the monk St. Gildas, one of the apostles of Brittany, they were no fugitive barbarians that reached the Armorican shores, swept from their own land of Britain by the Saxon fire and sword. They landed in successive bands upon the rocky north of the peninsula, which they had chosen as a place of refuge, not only because of its position, but because it was desolate and in great part uninhabited; and their settlement upon the Continent was far from being all a scene of battle and massacre, as it has been sometimes represented. There was in it the element of the coming of the Christian religion. The *dolmen* became the pedestal for the cross, the solitude of the forests changed to the home of the saints and their followers, who tilled the cleared lands for a scanty harvest. In a few years the Breton colony was ruled by a Bishop Mansuetus, who sat at the Council of Tours in 461, and he was reigning over his spiritual realm of peace, while Reothime, the Breton chief, was out with his long-haired warriors against the Visigoths. To this day the towns and villages of Brittany prove by their names that if the first Bretons were feared in battle, their life of peace went on at the same time in hamlet and cloister with great fruit of holiness. A mere list of the founders of the monasteries gives name after name to which the popular voice accorded the title of saint. The primitive forests were taken to make seclusion for the early monasteries by St. Samson at Dol, St. Suliac on the right of the river Rance, St. Lunaire on the left; St. Brieuc and St. Briau; St. Efflam, St. Paul Aurelian and St. Goulven; St. Kirec, St. Hervé, St. Urvoi, St. Gouëznou; St. Ténénan and Guennolé; St. Corentin and St. Ronan and St. Gildas: these and many

more are the fathers of the Breton Faith. The coming of the cross was not to be forgotten in our sketch, but the after-history of the land is outside our subject. When Henry VIII. was reigning in England, and Francis I. beyond the Channel, the province ceased to be a dukedom, and passed under the dominion of France; but it retained its own parliament until the great Revolution. That was a terrible time for Brittany. The wayside crosses were cast down literally by the hundred, the churches raised in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, countless and marvellously beautiful, were pillaged and wrecked. But the men of Morbihan rose in the night and dragged down the trees of liberty. The Bretons, in the war of La Vendée and in the wild peasant fighting of the *chouannerie* on their own soil, wrote their protest in blood against the Revolution; and struggling with the Republican "Blues" within hearing of the bells of their own shrines, they clung with the tenacity of the race to their double inheritance, their Faith and their loyalty. So it is that we can read the story of Brittany upon its own ground. The mounds and *menhirs* tell of its early darkness. The wayside cross of stone, reared upon an altar of some shadowy long-forgotten deity, represents the coming of the light. The ruined castles, with their weedy moats and towers capped with pointed roofs, are haunted yet by the shade of the chivalry and valour, once proverbial of the Breton, and still his possession. The old manor-houses, the chateaux still tenanted, bear witness to long periods of peace; but the broken crosses of Finistère, the ruined "Calvaries" outside churches, whose carving has been ruthlessly broken away, these are the sad records of what Breton loyalty cost in the last years of the eighteenth century. Finally, the thousand shrines that still remain, the church at Auray, with its miraculous statue of St. Anne, the patroness of Brittany; St. Jean le Doigt, with its relic of the Baptist; Notre Dame de Bon Secours, and many more to which at the time of the "*pardon*," winds the procession of white-capped women and long-haired sturdy labourers, not in hundreds but in thousands—all these countless shrines are the enduring testimony to the Faith of the Brittany of our own day.

And now comes the question, what has that Faith done for the land? Let us take, one by one, each part of the triple charge brought against it. First: superstition. This term, when it refers to customs in a Catholic country, is made to include practices of religion and traditions of piety. But there is something to be said of it in the true sense of the word; afterwards we can pass on to the influence of that religion, whose holiest usages are daily insulted by the name. It cannot be denied that a vast number of superstitions are to be found

among the people, but these at least are the weird fancies of poets by nature, not of a debased and miserable race such as the Bretons are sometimes represented to be. It is not surprising to find many strange beliefs among the sailors of the coasts; and a few of them are curious enough to be worth noting. The St. Gildas fisherman, if his conscience has long been ill at ease, dreads that some night when he sleeps on shore he will be led out to embark in a black craft lying low in the water, but apparently empty; and once embarked, a sail will unfurl, and the boat will drift out to sea, with another added to her heavy freight of lost souls. On All Souls' Day the simple fishing folk see the spirits of the shipwrecked in the white surf of the tide, and imagine them floating landward, a soul on every wave, hailing each other, or struggling together wherever the white crests are meeting with a sob and rush of surge. That night in many a village the supper and the fire are left ready for those who will come back from the other world to visit their old homes. For these pensive and imaginative minds, when the wind moans softly at nightfall, the dead are saying their evening prayer; when the moonlight shines on the uneven base of some stone raised ages ago, the fairies are there, not tricky elves, but tall white-robed women, bright as lamps, who haunt the circles and the roofed grottoes of huge blocks, and are wedded to the *poulpicans*, the genii of the earth. These are a few of their quaint fables and fears. Others relate to throwing bread into St. Michael's well, to recover lost property; touching the *roulers*, or rocking stones of Pontivy, sending a lighted torch to sea, that it may drift towards the body of the drowned; or securing the burnt sprig of broom from the fire of St. John's Eve. Such customs as the two last are probably traceable to the old Druidic times; but the lighting of St. John's fires is a now harmless yearly festival, kept up in all Celtic nations, and not unknown beyond them, and it is of course a substitute in Christian times for some similar practice in a pagan age. As to the superstitions which have survived from that time, or sprung later into being, they are as distinct from the piety of the people as are the weeds from the wheat of the field; and such weeds are to be condemned none the less because they bear the attractive blossom of poetry. To return from this digression upon superstitions properly so-called, we may note, before passing on, how that poetry which colours those superstitions seems to be a natural product of the Breton soil. As in other countries which we call primitive, the gift of Brizeux lies in many a peasant heart, "wanting," as Wordsworth says, "the accomplishment of verse." The race is yet in the simplicity of its childhood. It has not learned to suppress ardent feeling, or

disguise it in formality ; and here the outspoken word often reveals a noble current of thought, inspired by familiarity with the natural beauty of the country and the supernatural beauty of religion. "It's grand to be alive to-day !" says the labourer touching his hat to the stranger on the road, and expressing in a word his exuberant joy that the summertide is so glorious in his own land. He will speak of the coming autumn, and call it, in his own tongue, the winter-summer, the summer-ending, the sweeper of the leaves. For him the harvest is the month of white straw, with a whole picture of country life in the name. He gives a common-place thought a quaint turn that transforms it into poetry, and he that listens and reflects is at once startled, admiring and amused, like the Londoner of whom an Irish haymaker asked, with a touch of his hat, "What was the age of the daylight?" But in Brittany the most beautiful expressions are those inspired by religion. Ask the mother how many children she has? "Three," she will answer, perhaps, "and I gave two to the good God." If she is a woman of the fisheries, ask, where is her husband? "He is out on the good God's sea." And the sailor himself has a prayer that is a poem—"My God, protect me ; my ship is so little, and Thy sea so great!"

And now to proceed to the answer to what is meant by the charge of superstition, we may take a few instances of the traditional practices and effects of religion among the Bretons, glancing at religion as shown in times of sorrow ; in mutual charity ; in marriages and festivities ; in pilgrimages ; and in the influence of the priesthood.

Faith in the wisdom and providence of "the good God" is interwoven with the whole of the Breton's life ; and it gives him, if not fearlessness in the face of misfortune and death, at least a perfect resignation. When the cholera visited Finistère in 1832, even Émile Souvestre, who would have been but too likely to condemn this resignation as the fruit of ignorance rather than of piety, acknowledges, as a witness of these scenes, the blessing which religion brought to the people of the country, while those in the more "progressive" towns felt the scourge more heavily because of the irreligious spirit in which it found them. The Bretons, who were true to their national piety, knowing in those days more of the power of prayer than of medical science, prepared for the worst by making ready wide graves in the churchyards, and then before shrine and altar throwing themselves in life or death upon the mercy of God. Still, when death menaces the home of the Breton, his first thought is of his patron saints and of some shrine of the Madonna, where the burning taper is set to plead all day, till its flame dwindles to the socket, for the wife, child, or aged

father, who may never come to kneel there again. Beside their resignation, one of the most beautiful evidences of their piety is the charity of the poor to those who are poorer still. The orphan child is adopted into another home, in some instances the new mother being chosen by the priest of the district; and where the home is too poor to support another inmate, the neighbours pledge themselves each to give some portion of the little stranger's support. With them the needy are "God's guests." "When the poor man comes to your door," runs an old saying, "if you give nothing, speak to him courteously." And the usual salutation of the mendicant is the same as that also found in the mouth of the guest amongst the Celtic Irish—"God bless all here!" To which the inmates of the cottage answer, "and you also!" When the poorest are about to marry, the dowry of the bride is given in rustic fashion in kind, and the house furnished by the charity of friends; and the bride and bridegroom, who were in deepest poverty yesterday, ask the whole country-side that has enriched them to share their wedding festivities. A Breton marriage in all ranks of life, from the farmer of substance down to the most needy, makes a feast-day for the whole neighbourhood, and has its own curious customs. It is first arranged by the *bazvalan*, who is generally the village tailor, because that individual, who in Brittany receives an equal amount of confidence and of contempt, has access in his work to all the houses, and is accustomed to dine not at the first table where the men are served, but at the second with the women of the household. On the wedding morning he comes to the home of the bride, bearing the green sprig from which his name has come, *baz-valan*, "branch of broom." A long discussion, quaint and poetic, here takes place between him and the family of the house, who come one by one to answer his repeated inquiry whether they have seen the white dove he has lost. After many evasions the concealment of the white dove in the house is confessed, and the bride is introduced to meet her chosen husband, who is led in by the *bazvalan*; and this long and antiquated ceremony, which began with the words, "In the name of the Almighty Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, blessing be to this house and more joy than is mine," ends with the bride's invocation of her parents' blessing, and often a *De Profundis* for the departed. The old songs of the wedding feast are mournful in their character, and sung to monotonous music; and eminently characteristic of the Breton life is the "Song of the Bride," which is still chaunted to the repetition of a few changing notes, just as it was centuries ago in the days of "the good Duchess Anne." It begins by wishing a happy marriage to

the former companion of the girls who sing, and to "*Monsieur votre époux.*" Then they remind her of the good counsels of the priest as to fidelity and love, having first sung how they will go now to festivity and dance, while "*Madame la mariée*" will go no more, but stay at home and take care of her house. They sing of her humble round of duties, and of the care she must have for her sheep and cows, and then the song, which is a perfect description of the life of the *Bretonne*, closes with "Receive this bouquet which we offer you; it is made of the wild broom (*genêt*) to remind you that all vain honours pass away like flowers." The accompanying music was for many generations the somewhat mournful tones of the national instrument, the *biniou*, a kind of bagpipes. Now the *biniou* has gone much out of use. Once it was heard at every "*pardon*" when the evening came, and the people, finding themselves gathered together, finished the work of the day with a dance of slow and measured movements. There is undoubtedly something strange in the custom of ending a pilgrimage with a dance, but probably the rejoicings amongst the young folks on the homeward road arose originally from some idea of the freedom and joy of the accomplished journey and the blessings of the "*pardon.*" As to the frequentation of the taverns at such times, there is a word to be said, because it is made constantly an excuse for sneering at the spirit of the pilgrimages. In the pilgrimage of St. Anne d'Auray, between twenty and thirty thousand people throng annually to one spot from every part of the country. It is not surprising that among such a multitude there are many by whom the occasion is abused, and these, who compared with the rest are a small minority, are the few who attract the attention of the stranger. It is in a spirit of thorough unfairness that the pilgrims of Brittany are stigmatised as rough peasants who end their prayer in a drunken revel; a prejudiced traveller on this side of the Channel might as well take note of every sign of the disorderly element in the public holidays, or the weddings and funerals of the lower classes, and putting all his notes together charge the English honest working people with more abuse and irreverence than is ever set down to the Bretons. Again, the critical stranger, who is there to find fault, is apt to count amongst the disorderly the crowds of well-behaved and pious men and women, who have arrived and will go back to their homes footsore with a journey of many miles, and for whom the refreshment of the wayside inn is a necessity. Lastly, in many cases where the poor Breton of the pilgrimage disedifies the critical on-looker, it is acknowledged that the very frugality of his life makes him peculiarly unfit to bear the exchange of the cider of

his home for the wine of the town, or for the spirit to which instead of the French misnomer "water of life" the Breton gives a strangely appropriate name, "wine of fire," *guin-ardant*. So much for the few blots which it is the custom to magnify; for the rest the pilgrimages are in themselves seasons of renewed piety and blessing, and as regards the world living testimonies to the faith of the people. It is said that in no part of France are the churches filled as they are in Brittany, and when Christmas comes, no matter how inclement the season may be, the roads are covered with converging streams of country people, rosary in hand, making for the common centre, the village church and the midnight mass. Hours before, the twilight has been filled with voices far and near when the youths and girls were out at the wayside crosses, answering each other, or joining in the chorus of the *Noëls*. "Why," sang the men, "are those crowds upon the roads? Why do the people move in groups towards the church in the night?" "It is," answered the young maidens, "because to-day the Messiah is born. It is because to-day we adore our Redeemer." Then the youths again, "Why are there prayers night and day in the churches? Why do the priests say mass at midnight? Why do they say three?" "Because one must be glad to-day," came the answer; "to-day is accomplished the great mystery of the Nativity." Then all together broke into a chorus, like the whole hymn, full of beautiful teaching, "This night renews the plan of the world's life: this night creates again the children of Adam: this night fills our hearts with joy, and blots out the sin of Eve: this night gives us a Saviour full of sweetness and of love. Sing then, for it is His Feast, sing Noël, Noël!" These are the same simple truths that are told to the crowd in the churches. Peasants sing them at the roadside; men, peasant-born and anointed greater than kings, preach them from the pulpit with a God-given unction. The people listen to those sermons of their Breton priests not with stolid gravity, not with quiet silence. They have the Celtic outspoken enthusiasm, the mighty heart quickly moved and impatient of restraint. Women sob, and men beat their breasts. The multitude shudders at the thought of a lost eternity, and the overburdened soul prays aloud, unnoticed, and unconsciously. Yet the men who stir thus the depths of human nature have been but lately the *kloarëcks* of some college at Vannes, or Quimper, or Tréguier, or S. Brieuc; and before that, they were country youths perhaps in neighbouring villages or homesteads. But once the student days were over, the words of ordination spoken, the ministry begun, they had left, in truth,

father and kindred and risen suddenly to the principedom of another world. Should they go back to the old home, parents would kneel to them, brothers and friends would do humblest service to the anointed of God, older men would crave their words of counsel, till they, grown old in turn, would be in temporal as well as in spiritual things the fathers of their people. Veneration for the dignity of the priesthood possessed to this degree belongs to the Bretons, not only because they are Catholic, but because they are Celtic. The influence of their pastors and of their religion has given a solemnity as well as a graceful softness, not a weakness, to their character. Courtesy to the stranger is with them a national custom. They have not that polish and affectation of formal compliment which gave rise to the saying that every Spaniard is a gentleman; theirs is the better attribute of simple and frank Christian courtesy. The labourer on the country road does not walk stolidly by, kicking the dust before him. He raises his hand to his hat at the sight of a strange face, and exchanges a word; and if the traveller has the good luck to know the Breton tongue, he will understand the peasant's salutation, "God bless you!"

A good proof that all this is, indeed, the softening and beautifying, not the weakening, of the race, lies in the Breton's preservation to this day of his aptitude for military service and his national valour. Every war waged yet by the arms of France has counted Breton names in the ranks, and Breton blood in the price of its glory or in the penalty of its loss; while the French navy, with its chief arsenal on the coast of Finistère, is chiefly manned by the men of Brittany. It has been always so; since the days when the Duke Alain sent his five thousand men across the Channel with the Norman Conqueror, the hardy race has kept its character for readiness to serve at the first sound of war. The land of Du Guesclin in the old days has brought forth new heroes at each generation, and in later times claims many illustrious names, amongst them those of the family of Charette. If Breton bravery paid its tribute time after time to the victories of France, it gave still more generously for a cause even higher than that of country—the cause of the Church, the freedom of the Holy See. When the call of Lamoricière roused the Catholic world in 1860, the sons of Brittany came in answer from the château, from the workshop, from the furrowed field. All the time from Castelfidardo to the disbandment at Rome, their names were to be seen, noble and historic, humble and unknown, mingled in honourable numbers upon the list of the Zouaves. And those who are familiar with the sad but glorious history of the long struggle for the freedom of Rome will recognise such

names as those of Arthur de Chalus, Rogatien Picou, Joseph Guerin, Paul de Parcevaux, and his cousin of Quimper, Hyacinth de Lanascot. It would take a long roll-call to tell of the multitude of Bretons who sealed their faith with their blood under the white and yellow banner. Any one who glances at the chapter, called defiantly *Les Mercénaires** in M. Veuillot's history of the time, will find page after page filled with the record of Breton heroism, from the "glorious death" of Count Gaston de Plessis, "in the midst of the young heroes, amongst whom Brittany numbered so many of her sons,"† to the letter of farewell from the wounded carpenter, Gicquel, who offered gladly an equally noble sacrifice, but lived to go back to his bench and his tools. Nor should we forget the heroism of those who gave up freely the sons of their Breton homes in the hour of peril, the women of Brittany who at need were "valiant." It was the spirit at once of their religion and of their nation that gave to such as Mdme. de Lanascot‡ the courage of the mothers of martyrs; and many unknown names in the remote depths of the province deserve an equal commemoration with hers.

We shall turn from the consideration of the devotion of the Bretons to the Church in word and in deed, and its influence softening, sanctifying, ennobling the rough strength of the national character; and next comes before us the second charge—ignorance. We have seen how they have realised the boast of their race, "If we die like Christians and like Bretons, we shall never die too soon;" and now we are told that this land of honesty, of simple faith, and of innate heroism is in a lamentably backward, almost a barbarous condition, because a large proportion of its people is illiterate.§ The statistics of

* "Le Piémont dans les États de l'Eglise," par Eugène Veuillot.

† Report of the *Journal de Rennes*.

‡ This truly valiant woman having hastened to Italy on hearing of her son's wounds, reaching his death-bed, heard him say, "I am happy, I have done my duty; mother, I am dying!" "My child," she answered, "God's holy will be done! Let us say the *Te Deum*." And before the breaking heart had finished the hymn of praise, her son had given his soul to God.

§ The Bretons have certainly not yet heard of the idea of making what is called "higher education" universal. They express their common-sense view of the *Bretonne's* domestic duties in saying, "Jeanne is Jeanne's servant; Jeanne and her servant churn the butter together." And imagining Jeanne carried to the opposite extreme (perhaps by local university examinations), they give her a place between the reprehensible and the impossible, in a quaint rhyme, which may be translated—

"A woman given to drinking wine,
A maid in Latin scholarly,
A sun too early come to shine—
God knows what their end will be!"

education in Côtes du Nord, given in the work edited by M. Charpentier, show that this department at least was, in 1865, in advance of many others in France; that during the previous thirty years it contained only eight communes that were without one or more schools; and that these schools were attended by forty-five thousand children, a number which is continually on the increase. It is not, of course, to be assumed that Finistère and Morbihan are in this respect equal to Côtes du Nord; but in these departments, too, the Christian brothers have laboured long; and throughout the land, in many a village school and church, the peasantry are taught the doctrines of the Faith and the duties of life—a far higher knowledge, and one more valuable to a nation than any that is imparted by School Boards. There are also the flourishing colleges at Vannes, Quimper, and other towns, where the students, or *kloarëcks*, from the noble house and from the labourer's family, study side by side in preparation for Holy Orders—the sons of the soil being in many cases distinguished above the rest by their high intelligence. Such teaching, whether in the college or in the depths of the country in the roadside school, has kept alive and cherished all that was true and loyal, all that was at once simple and noble, in the character of the people. But for even remote Brittany the battle has to be waged now against that greatest enemy of the Faith and of society—godless education.* The Prefect of Finistère but lately made war at one and the same time upon religious teaching in the schools, and the example of piety outside their walls in the public processions; and one of the last acts of the Prefect of Morbihan has been to force State schools upon the people of Vannes, by closing the school of the Christian brothers, which for more than ten years had been a public benefit to the city. What is to be the end of such times as these for Brittany if the people cannot effectually struggle against sowing in their children a harvest that, if it should spread and ripen, must be reaped by the old province yet with exceeding bitterness? As far as education is concerned, modern progress desires to make that loyal land at once un-Breton and un-Catholic. It is not many years ago since a champion of such progress thought he had hit upon a plan for playing off religion against patriotism, and patriotism against religion; and then was made the foul suggestion that the Breton priests should withhold First Communion from the children until they had passed the test of speaking French instead of their mother-tongue. And here, in view of the staunch faith

* The protests of Catholic Brittany against the Bill of M. Jules Ferry were amongst the first to be signed, and their outspoken language had the true ring of heroism.

and truth of this simple people, let another tell us, in nobler words than ours, of the wisdom of Christian ignorance as compared with un-Christian knowledge, and the bane which may come to such a land as Brittany by forcing it out of its native atmosphere of humble labour and opening the treasures of the French press of to-day to the tillers of the soil. A voice from the other side of the Atlantic will sum up the whole question for us in a few words, leaving us, perhaps, more content with this much-despised Breton ignorance.

"If the teaching of history is a trustworthy guide," says Dr. Spalding,* "we are certainly safe in affirming that civilised States and Empires perish, not from lack of knowledge, but of virtue; not because the people are ignorant, but because they are corrupt. . . . It is not knowledge, but character, that is important; and character is formed more by faith, by hope, by love, admiration, enthusiasm, reverence, than by any patchwork of alphabetical and arithmetical symbols. . . . The curse of our age is that men will believe that, in education, to spell, to read, to write, is what signifies, and they cast aside the eternal faith, the infinite hope, the divine love, that more than all else makes us men. . . . Is there some mystic virtue in printed words, that to be able to read them should make us men? And even in the most enlightened countries what do the masses of men know? Next to nothing; and their reading, for the most part, stupefies them. . . . These ignorant masses, who, in the common schools, have been through the Fourth Reader, and who know nothing, not even their own ignorance, are confused. They doubt, they lose faith, and are enlightened by the discovery that God, the soul, truth, justice, honour, are only nominal—they do not concern Positivists. Can anything be more pitiful than the state of these poor wretches?—neither knowing nor believing; without knowledge, yet having nor faith nor love. God pity them that they are Communists, Internationalists, *Solidaires*; for what else could they be? No enthusiasm is possible for them but that of destruction. Religion is the chief element in civilisation, and consequently in progress. . . . Man is more than his knowledge. Simple faith is better than reading and writing. . . . But we are not the advocates of ignorance. We will praise with any man the true worth and inestimable value of education. Even mere mental training is, to our thinking, of rare price. Water is good, but without bread it will not sustain life. Wine warms and gladdens the heart of man; but, if used without care, it

* "Essays and Reviews," by Right Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D., Bishop of Peoria. "Essay on the Comparative Influence of Catholicism and Protestantism on National Prosperity."

maddens and drives to destruction. We are crying out against the folly of the age, which would make the school-room its church, education its sacrament, and culture its religion. It is the road to ruin."

This brings us to the third charge, which calls the Breton people culpably unprogressive. That is, they are accused of not having towns as wealthy, factories as numerous and full of labour, lands as scientifically cultivated as those of other parts of France. They do not make enough use of the printing press, and they were late with their railways; and because they happen to be pious as well as poor, all this is set down as coming decidedly, though in some indirect and inexplicable way, out of the influence of the Church. But these Bretons are not altogether without this world's goods—far from it. Their hills are loaded with rich veins of lead and iron, and the thews and sinews that were first tried in some village wrestling-match find the proper element for their persistent strength among the heat and noise of furnace and forge. The men seem to be specially fitted for the labours of the miner and the iron-worker, though when first they were made familiar with the giant power of steam their astonishment is said to have been like the half-fearful wonder of children. There are potteries, too, porcelain making, and some remains of a once prosperous cloth manufacture. Without anything like the perfection of agriculture in more advanced countries, the labourers upon the soil make it improve in the north from year to year, and in the flat undulating south are gradually reclaiming much of the waste ground for cultivation, while they use the broad *landes* for pasturage. The northern departments have their flourishing vineyards, where the living green covers trellised arcades, and the richer districts bring every kind of cereal to yellow ripeness; while in the south the orchards make the cultured tracts beautiful with their showers of blossom, and then yield a wealth of fruit to the cider presses. Once the whole land would have realised the famous apostrophe of Brizeux, "*O terre de granit recouverte de chênes!*" But long before his time most of the wooded ground, especially that of Morbihan, had been cleared. In the west, and still more in the north, the great forests remain, and ship-building on the coast and other kinds of industry in timber is carried on by means of the magnificent and unfailing supply from such ground as Lorges, La Hunauday, Coat-an-nos, Boquen, Loudéac, and La Houdinaye. The fisheries along the coast, in creating a necessity for Breton-built craft, have led as a consequence to the working of hemp into every form, from stout cables down to cordage and twine, in native roperies. The

population of the shores makes, indeed, in many ways one of the most prosperous and important divisions of the people, and not only are their fishing smacks, like those of Normandy, scattered over the widening waters of the English Channel; their small vessels venture across the ocean to Newfoundland, where there is many a Breton to be found in the fisheries. Fearless of peril, and with a natural instinct for the enterprise of the sailor's life, the race, if it has not enriched its own province, has at least done no small service upon the sea for the larger country instead; and France, in her navy and in her merchant service, numbers between nineteen and twenty thousand of the men of Brittany. The splendid harbour on the coast of Finistère was fittingly chosen to become a naval port, and Brest to be the great arsenal of France. But Brest, with its life of nineteenth century business, its storehouses and modern public buildings, and its population of seamen, has grown into the least Breton town in Brittany. Nor, if one follows the canal cut through the length of the peninsula for bringing provisions to the fortress in time of war, will one find at the opposite southern extremity a thoroughly Breton town in old historic Nantes. The typical towns of Brittany are such as Quimper, or Quimperlé, or Dinan, or Carhaix, where the nineteenth century mingles with the seventeenth, or the sixteenth, or even an earlier period; where churches, that are prayers in stone, call to mind the bygone time when labour was grandly ambitious because the Christian and the artist and the workman were one. There are the streets where the antique carving of buttress and corner, the old granite portals below, the matchlessly uneven roofs above, mock the substantial and practical unsightliness of new, and perhaps more ambitious, dwellings. There the townsfolk of the olden time walk out as in the pages of a romance, or in the fancy of a dream, and talk about elections and railways; while the overhanging stories of the older houses nod across the narrow sunlight of the streets to busy shops of this trafficking age. What those towns need—what is needed by the whole country—is not the will and the power of labour, but the capital by which material for labour is supplied. The “little country” depends upon a greater country, and what is desirable from the rest of France is that it should help the province which was so long left almost as unknown ground, that out of its wealth it should give a better chance of prosperity to the *petite patrie*, offering thereby not luxury but more of the refinements of comfort, not false principles and godless teaching to delude the mind but honest work to occupy the hand. But if the maxims of '89 and the un-Christian schools of the State must needs come in these degenerate days with what

is called progress, better far that Brittany should let the more advanced peoples progress before her on the highway of the Revolution, and she standing in the background should wait God's time, keeping her old-world aspect, true to her traditional loyalty and to her ancient Faith.*

In opposition to the movement of false advancement which struggles to make way in the province from outside, there is a counter movement of true progress continually at work in the heart of the country. While the one seeks almost as its basis to bring the French language into general use, the other strives, as the best safeguard of religion and nationality, to keep alive the Breton tongue. Foremost in this work was for many years the Bishop of Quimper and Léon, Mgr. Marie-Joseph Graveran. He stands out, a noble and venerable figure, from the quiet history of his province in these later days. In his former See he is held in perpetual remembrance, known among the people by his old name of the *Biscop Gwenn*, the White Bishop, because long before he left them his hair was white, not with years, but with much care and many labours. The work of preserving the Breton language was undertaken by him as a sacred duty. He pressed his friends and priests into the task he had taken to heart, and in his zeal he was always forming fresh plans, and then seeking out those who were most willing and best fitted to execute them. While Le Gonidec was interesting the world beyond in what it called the revival of a dead language; while Brizeux was turning the thoughts of the capital towards his own furze-clad moorlands; while others were bringing wisdom and science to the task of telling of the glories of the old province,† the White Bishop had begun to publish, not new literature of Brittany, but Breton literature for the Bretons. He introduced

* Some fears for Breton truth to old principles will have been aroused by recent events in Morbihan, where not only was the Count de Mun defeated in the election at Pontivy, but a boisterous crowd assembled outside his house the same night, and the Marseillaise was sung in the streets. But we should bear in mind that Pontivy had three times the honour of being represented by the man who is pre-eminently in France the champion of God and of the right; that, after a fourth election by an overwhelming majority, he was only defeated by intimidation and official candidature, and that he himself addressing his 10,000 supporters thanked them for the "indomitable courage," without which they could not have remained faithful despite the manœuvres employed against them; adding a few words which we may repeat for the sake of the fame of the Morbihannais—"Votre ancien député restera le vrai représentant de vos sentiments et de vos convictions. Mes amis, confiance et courage! L'avenir est à nous! Nous nous sommes levés pour Dieu; Dieu ne nous abandonnera pas."

† We should not here pass over without reference the very valuable labours of Dom le Pelletier and the French Benedictines.

into his diocese a Breton branch of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, and published the annals in the native tongue ; but as the publication was meant to reach people who knew little of printed books, the first part was prefaced by an introduction in verse, each couplet beginning with a different letter, so as to furnish a popular alphabet. The editor he chose was the Abbé Henry, who afterwards under his patronage published a collection of the national hymns, and having translated the Old Testament into Breton, wrote in the same language a "Life of our Lord" in the words of the four Evangelists. At the same time the *Histor Briez* was written, the history of Brittany told like a fireside story ; and this work also was inspired by Mgr. Graveran. It was under his patronage, too, that the *Revue d'Armorique* was carried on, which afterwards became the *Revue de Bretagne et de la Vendée*. Brittany has now a well-represented newspaper press ; and the successor of the *Bisop Gwenn* in the See of Quimper and Léon founded in 1865 the Breton *Feiz ha Briez* ("Faith and Brittany"). Thus has the influence of the Church given a new impetus to Christian learning in the old province in our days, and the people whose language it fostered are well worthy of having a noble literature of their own,* since in bygone times it was so largely their possession that they had wealth to give away to those who would borrow the stories of their history, the legends recorded by their monks, or further back still the half-fabulous tales of chivalry sung by their bards—romances, weird scenes, and bright fancies, that have been brought into our own literature again and again, from the time when under the Norman monarchs Court poets traced the path for the laureate of to-day.

Even now in tradition-loving Brittany the bard of the old times lives in the street minstrel, who chaunts his story or his lament for the evening-crowd in the market-place or on the church steps. The verses thus sung frequently relate to recent events, with that same instinct for telling the news abroad which we find in the English ballad ; but with the Bretons, instead of being rough rhyme, it is often impassioned poetry, composed perhaps by some native poet, whose work in the French tongue is not quite unknown outside the province. As an example of the subject and the poem chosen by the Breton nineteenth-century minstrel, we shall take a few words from the impassioned lament which M. de la Villemarqué heard sung at Quimper. The man stood near the door of the cathedral, and

* In paying our tribute to national genius in Brittany, the name of Chateaubriand has not been mentioned. Though a son of the province, he seems not to have preserved any of the natural Breton affection for the "*petite patrie*." His sympathies were French, and so was his genius.

he was singing for a handful of *sous* ; but he knew what would win the crowd. Within the portal, at a distance of but a few paces, lay the white effigy of Mgr. Graveran, and it was of the *Biscop Gwenn* that the singer chaunted in sorrowful monotone "Once it was sad," he sang, "to see towers of the cathedral of Quimper ; for four centuries they had remained unfinished. One day he said gently, with a smile,—' My children build the spires of St. Corentin ;' and forthwith came the men of Cornonaille, of Léon, even of Tréguier, to offer their *sous* to the good Bishop, and the white spires of Quimper carried up to heaven their witness to the Faith of the Bretons. . . . Priests and people, and you, ye poor of Jesus, widows, orphans, all the afflicted, you have lost your friend, your pastor, your father. Oh ! Bretons, how our hearts are breaking ! . . . Good pastor come down from Heaven again, and from the height of our cathedral towers bless the country that you loved. Bless the poor, the sad, our sailors, our soldiers, all the Breton people. Bless, too, the graves where our fathers and our mothers are sleeping. Ask from God that we may keep our Faith, the old Faith of Gralon, and of Gwenolé, the Faith of the saints of Brittany, so that on the world's last day there may yet be Bretons kneeling in prayer at (Our Lady's shrine of) Rumengol!"

It was in 1855, before the workmen's scaffoldings were removed from the rising spires of St. Corentin, that the *Biscop Gwenn* had been summoned away from his devoted people. A few years after his death great changes came. The quaint old town of Quimper was startled by the coming of steam in 1863, and two years after the iron paths of the railway were not only to be found in a continuous line encircling the whole province like a belt along the coasts, but the trains swept also through the mountains and straight across the centre from S. Briec at the north to Auray, of holy memories, in the south of Morbihan. The coming of the railway to Quimper was hailed by some lovers of old Brittany with a cry of despair. There was even a circular sent round to the principal townspeople inviting them to be present at "the funeral procession of the manners, customs, language, and traditions of Armorican-Brittany, dying to-day in the nineteen-hundredth year of her age,"—the ceremony to take place to-morrow at the railway station. But there was no real cause for that melancholy satire, and those who knew the province best were far from sharing in the agitation. "Let steam come," writes M. de la Villemarqué, "no one will be afraid of it. Our skies will not be less blue, our valleys less verdant, . . . our giants of Carnac less immovable, our bells less bravely rung, our crosses

less strong, our disdain less supreme for the scoffers who walk past insulting them. The noise of the locomotives will not drown the holy chimes of our churches, nor put down the voice of our two thousand Breton priests; for, even less than us, are they afraid of smoke! Like every good thing He has created, God has made this for the service of man." And then he goes on to note two services that have been already done by the establishment of the railways—the bringing of the various parts of the province into closer relation with each other, and the closing of many of the inns which tempted the traveller on now disused roads. Unfortunately since that time the prefects under the Republic have permitted the traffic in intoxicating drinks to increase to an extent which must be greatly regretted; for intemperance is certainly too often the one fault of the honest, hard-working, and home-loving Bretons. It was a failing to which their noble qualities did not blind Mgr. Graveran, and he would exclaim with mingled sorrow and pride, "My Breton people, the day that, without stopping, you pass by those accursed taverns, that day you will be the first people on the earth."

It is well to think that, in these years, while more and more about simple Brittany rises the unholy tide of new and false teaching, there are yet men fired with the zeal of the *Biscope Gwenn* to hold it back, to keep it from pressing forward from the frontier of France and inward from the coasts. They have the same love for the brave old province, the same realisation of the necessity of keeping it Breton if they would keep it Catholic; and Mgr. Graveran's opinion of the value of the native tongue has been confirmed by Pius IX., in one of his marvellously significant words spoken to the Abbé Léséleuc—"Guard," he said, "as the apple of your eye, that language which preserves your Faith." Nor was it alone the language of the Bretons that the zealous prelate laboured in his time to preserve. He had the hardihood to declare that he would not have them put aside their old customs or their national costume, lest that polish of civilisation, which the world said they needed, might be also a wearing down, an effacing of the precious imprint of their religious character. "Have respect for yourselves as Christians," he said; "that title has not its equal upon earth in grandeur and in promise. Esteem yourselves as Bretons; that name, when it is borne as it should be, is a pledge of attachment to the old Faith, of fidelity to the practices of religion, of constancy in the path of duty."

ART. VI.—THE DEMANDS OF IRELAND.

1. *Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland.* Dublin. 1869.
2. *Irish Intermediate Education Bill, Ireland.* House of Commons. 1878.
3. *A Bill to make Better Provision for University Education in Ireland.* House of Commons. 1879.

THE law under discussion at present throughout France may be taken to represent the extreme anti-Catholic position on the question of education. Between it and the sound Catholic education theory, a multitude of schemes, some unorthodox, some temporizing, some orthodox but impracticable, commend themselves to the intelligence, and engage the zeal, of the numberless speculators on the subject. A question of policy with one set of men, a question of expediency with another, a question for Parliament, a question for poor-law boards, a question for prison boards, a question at the hustings, a question at the election of a town councillor, a serious question for the pater-familias, education, secular or religious, is the topic most widely discussed, most generally agitated about in this quarter of the century, the nineteenth of our Christian era. France, always in advance in revolutionary movements, has taken the matter in hand, and proposes to make a wholesale change in the education system. Hitherto, religion and education were permitted to have something in common. If religion was not made part of the *curriculum* of the Lycée or the college, it was at least permitted as an *ad libitum* object of study, and men and women were not excluded from the office of teaching simply and solely because they were religious. The teachers of France, who are religious, may be counted at this moment by tens of thousands, and zeal for their work and efficiency are their recognized characteristics. The proposed legislation contemplates cancelling at once the privilege of teaching for all persons guilty of membership in any religious order, congregation, or community whatsoever, not recognized by the State, the State recognizing scarcely any. Education is not to be allowed to come in contact with the religious element at any point. Such is the tenor of the Bill of M. Jules Ferry, French Minister of Instruction. We shall not now go into its clauses in detail. It is sufficient to say of it, that it constitutes religion a positive disqualification for any post connected with education, from the village schoolmastership to the Council of Public Instruction.

The tendency of legislation such as this is obvious, and the motives of the legislators are not difficult to interpret. Society is to be un-Christianized, and by consequence uncivilized. They mean the first result, they think they do not mean the second, but never was there a more inevitable sequence. Christianity made education a special object of its care from the beginning, an anxious and a troublesome charge, but it was necessarily wound up with the mission of the Church. At first it was the task of unteaching men views and ideas and ways that could not be adapted to the law of Christ. Afterwards it was the less painful, but still equally solicitous task of training and fashioning young minds, as they developed into thoughtfulness, to the ways and views and ideas that should be found in Christian men. The solicitude demanded was unremitting and comprehensive. It could not afford to slumber or take respite, it could not venture to leave out of its charge any serious occupation, indeed any occupation or circumstances, of those whom, on the day of their baptism, it had taken under its protection. It had to correct and humanize a people who, with all their literary and artistic culture, found a pleasure, nay, an enjoyment, in witnessing the savage encounters of half-naked gladiators, and who did not think a holiday worth having unless they beheld the floor of their amphitheatre overflowing with blood. It had to tone down the pride and ferocity of the masters and conquerors of the world, and mould them to the meekness and humility of Christ. It had to expurgate their learning of all that was gross and degrading in doctrine, and filthy and revolting in morals. It had to take painting and sculpture and architecture under its direction, and detaching the artist's mind from pagan forms, create within it new, pure, and ennobling conceptions. This is the work of education which Christianity has had to do, concurrently with the announcing of the Gospel and the ministry of the sacraments, a work not effected once for all, but always being effected continuously, perseveringly. It goes on, but it is not always successful, it is constantly checked, it is sometimes spoiled, in particular localities it is at times effaced, for it has the world and the powers of darkness incessantly opposing it from without, and, even as in Christ's own day, traitors will be found within the Church, dishonouring the trust that has been confided to them.

The present hour of trial is, then, though severe indeed, not a singular or exceptional incident in the history of the Church's relations to education, nor is France the only country engaged in the struggle between the Church and secularism. Germany, in her Falk laws, has almost proscribed Catholic education. The secular party in Belgium is as zealous about the evil work as their greater neighbours, to whom they are second in range of

influence, not in perversity of will. In England, although a noble protest has been entered against Jules Ferry's Bill as unfair and equivalently unconstitutional, religious education for Catholics labours under deplorable disadvantages. But Ireland it is, with its vast Catholic population, representing a majority of five to one of the inhabitants of the country, all demanding a system of education consistent with the principles of the faith they profess, that has most to complain—that is, in reality, most sorely aggrieved. The small fractional share which the Catholics of Ireland have in the law-making of the Empire must leave them, for the legislation which they desire, to the justice, the equity or the policy of the, for the time being, prevailing majority. The grievance is very often descanted on with allusion to the past history of the Irish Church, but we fear that this is only waste of breath. That the Catholic Church in Ireland was foully wronged, that the donations of Catholic men were seized on by the high hand and diverted from the purposes for which they were made, and in many instances converted to purposes the most opposite to the intentions and declarations of the donors, is a fact that will not admit of question; but what can be the profit of preaching the necessity of restitution to those who do not believe in the obligation of restitution? Governments, in the matter of Church property, do not believe in restitution. Commutative justice on this score is not a State virtue; but distributive justice ought to be. The Catholics who bear in common with their Protestant fellow-countrymen the burdens of the Empire should, in common with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, be made sharers in the privileges and advantages of the Empire. Through some fatally misguided policy this has not yet been done for Irish Catholics. It is not our purpose, nor is it within our present scope, to investigate the causes of this maladministration. "Nothing will satisfy the Catholics of Ireland; they are in a state of chronic discontent," is the response of one political party. "The Irish have shown themselves so ungrateful for favours already received, they do not merit further consideration," is the excuse of another. If we sow the wind we know what we must expect to reap. The penal enactments enforced against Irish Catholics down to a comparatively recent date yielded a rich produce of alienation and discontent, and though the seed be not continued to be sown, it takes time and treatment to root out a crop that has once occupied the ground. The persistent refusal to accord equal educational privileges and provisions to Catholics as to Protestants is not the kind of treatment to eradicate discontent. Liberals and Conservatives both have been poor husbandmen, so far as the soil of Ireland is concerned. Then, for the plea of ingratitude, nowhere over

the broad face of the earth is there to be found a more grateful people, a people more tenacious of memory for service done; but human gratitude is not like the plant and flower which the Indian juggler produces from a seed before your eyes by some instantaneous process. To render a man grateful it is not enough to say to him, "I have done you a great service." Before the heart can be moved it must be seen and felt that the thing is done, and that it is a service. We shall probably refer to this point again, and show what little ground any of the political parties have for charging the Catholics of Ireland with ingratitude, and how mightily some politicians overrate and overstate the service they have done to Irish Catholicity.

But putting aside the makeshift explanations of rival political parties, wishing to account for their not doing what they are either unable or unwilling to do, the admitted fact stands up plainly before us, that in all educational endowments and provisions the Catholic people of Ireland have been, and continue to be, most inequitably treated. It is now plain that the first project was to Protestantize them by proscribing Catholic teaching and Catholic teachers under the penalties of misdemeanour and felony, at the same time surrounding Protestant teaching with all possible rewards and privileges. For a long weary period of trial and of temptation—(we say temptation, for the Irish Catholic thirsts for education)—this project was worked, but little or nothing came of it. Penalties for Catholic teaching no longer exist. The Catholic no longer teaches or learns at his own risk, but he does so still at his own expense. Mr. Gladstone proposed a Bill of University Education for Ireland in 1873, by which existing disabilities and inequalities were to be adjusted, as it was hoped, but alas! the disability of poverty for the Catholic and the inequality of endowment for the Protestant were to remain as unadjusted as ever. The Queen's University and Queen's Colleges have been now some thirty years in operation, and notwithstanding the facilities afforded for matriculation, they present but a wretched roll of students for the enormous outlay of public money. Yet we cannot say that there is a want of desire amongst our legislators to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the question. Many attempts have been made, and in some instances with great exercise of ingenuity, to bring the various parties interested in the subject to converge to a common basis of legislation, but up to the present all have ended in abortion. The late Mr. Butt brought his large intellect and high legal cultivation and experience to the framing of an Irish University Bill, which was extinguished by a breath. This very year a marked Government measure on the lines of the Intermediate Education Bill was actually pre-

pared, and whilst wise and thoughtful men in authority were engaged in the necessary preliminary details, it was rudely and suddenly extinguished. The irrepressible and baneful Orange element of Irish Conservatism, with the co-operation of a certain fanatical English clique, had its way. So much the worse. The O'Connor Don, a Catholic representative in the confidence of, and in open communication with, the Irish Bishops, has before the House at this moment a Bill, in which the requirements of Catholic education are reduced to a minimum. Distinguished members of the Conservative party have given in their names for its support, Liberal statesmen of the foremost rank have declared in its favour, and yet in all human probability the fate of its predecessors is awaiting it. Our theologians make a distinction between the *finis operis* and the *finis operantis*. The *finis operantis*, with those who oppose every form of demand for Catholic education, may be various, but the *finis operis* is clearly one. The scope of the opposition is to ignore individual conscience, and to set up the State conscience as the sole guide and arbitrator in matters religious as in matters secular. This new postulate of the science of Government is pretty generally adopted by the temporal rulers of the day. In Italy the State conscience became uneasy at the possession of so much temporal power and dominion by the Pope, and it thought it obligatory to take them from him. It was not advisable, either, that religious houses should possess property, no matter how legitimately acquired, and accordingly for the benefit of religion all religious goods must be transferred to the public treasury, the owners being graciously permitted to live and starve. The delicacy of the German State conscience is so sensitive, that it has to burthen itself with the care of parochial discipline, diocesan laws, church funds, canonical distributions, religious services, sacred ceremonies, preaching, teaching, &c. The State conscience of France is of a somewhat different type from the others, adopting natural equity as the principle of its action. It deems it unfair that the religious system should receive from Government any particular consideration or support, and therefore to remove all advantage of one side over the other, (this is the reasoning of the advocates of Jules Ferry's Bill), and to give a fair start in the race between religion and secularism, it proposes that henceforward all education shall be secular. Jesus Christ left us a command to hear the Church, and his Apostle teaches us to obey those that are set over us in the Church, as having to render an account to God of our souls, but the despots of modern society leave us no room for the fulfilment of the precept in either form.

This is the revolt of the pride of power; but the pride of

modern intellect rises also in revolt against God and His Church. Amongst the great ones and the wise ones of earth the defection from Christ is so nearly universal that it does not require a strained effort of imagination to suppose Him appealing to us as he did to His Apostles on the memorable occasion at Capharnaum, and asking, "*Et vos vultis abire?*" His co-Apostles left the answering to Peter then, "*Ad quem ibimus Domine? Verba aternæ vitæ habes,*" We in turn shall do well to make Peter our spokesman and leave the answering to him in this and in all our doubts and uncertainties. The Vatican Council teaches us that "the gift of truth and never failing faith was conferred on Peter and his successors in the Roman See, in order that they might discharge their high office for the salvation of all, that the entire flock of Christ, drawn away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the aliment of heavenly doctrine, that the occasions of division being removed, the universal Church might be preserved in unity, and resting on its own foundation might stand firm against the gates of hell." It is in virtue of this prerogative and charge that the successors of Peter not only cannot teach error themselves, but cannot remain silent and passive in the presence of teaching injurious or dangerous to faith or to Christian morals. And hence we have the glorious Pontiff, so recently taken from us, raising up his voice and with no uncertain sound, in a succession of allocutions from November, 1850, to the publication of the Syllabus, against the pernicious modern theories of education. The Pontifical instructions cover the whole ground in dispute, and meet by their wisdom and justice, whilst they confound by their supreme authority, all the attempted inroads of error. They teach us that the theory which asserts "that the entire direction of the public schools, in which the youth of any Christian State is educated, can and ought to be committed to the civil authority, and so fully committed to it, that the right of no other authority should be recognized in the discipline of the schools, in the direction of studies, in the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approbation of the masters," is a theory "invasive of the rights of the Church and gravely detrimental to religion," and the law, constructed on its principles, of October 4th, 1848, is designated a "*funestissima lex*, already producing pernicious fruits by the spreading of pestilential opinions and views opposed to the unchangeable doctrine of the Church."* They denounce the arrogance and expose the short-sightedness of the political philosophy, which proposes as "the most perfect plan of civil

* Allocution of November 1st, 1850, *In consistoriali*.

society, that one which insists that all popular schools open to the children of the various classes of the people, and public institutions destined for the education of youth in letters or in the severer studies, without exception should be exempted from all authority, direction, or interference of the Church, and left completely to the management of the civil and political authority in accordance with Government views, and on the lines of the common opinions of the day.”* These and other salutary instructions and admonitions on the state of modern society, which the venerable Pontiff, wise with the wisdom and experience of the Church, did not cease to send forth through his long tenure of Peter’s Chair, were received by the Powers to whom they were addressed with unconcealed contempt, and met by the derision of the modern liberal *philosophe*. Current history is, however, giving rapid verification to the words of Pio Nono on at least one subject, the organization of secret societies and the dangers to be apprehended from them, not only to the Church but also to the State, and the thought begins to force itself on the public mind that the wisdom and experience of the Church, reaching farther back into the past than the Statecraft of this century, are indicating for themselves a clearer and more distant range of vision into the future also.

Ad quem ibimus, Domine? Though the others be scandalized in the Vicar of Christ, yet not his brethren in the Episcopate. They rally to him, as true soldiers to their Captain, in the hour of peril. The presence of persecution has elicited for the consolation of the Holy Father the strongest proofs of the fidelity of his brethren and the highest recognition of his infallible magisterium. They remember the double petition in the prayer of Christ for Peter, *Rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*, and they appeal from every country of Christendom to the successor of Peter to instruct them how they are to guide their flocks through the labyrinth of false doctrines that surrounds them, and to fortify them out of that strength by which the Church is strong to indefectibility.

The Irish Bishops, to return to the subject of Irish education, as might well be expected from what we have already seen of the state of the question in this country, have been for the last fifty years among the most constant applicants for the instructions and counsel of the Holy See. Ultra-Liberal journalists and other high and sapient political censors, *blasphemantes quæ ignorant*, vilify them unsparingly, and lay at their doors sundry charges of “inconsistency,” “illiberality,” “irreconcilability” and persistently divided counsels. Nothing could be more unjust. In reality the history of the Irish

* Letter to the Archbishop of Friburg, July 14th, 1864.

Education question as it concerns the Bishops of Ireland is, ever since the year 1830, made up of a series of communications from them to the great teaching centre, setting forth the nature and advantages, or otherwise, of the different proposed schemes ; of prompt and obedient acceptance on their part of the instructions sent back, and of full and faithful promulgations of these to their flocks.

The Irish Education question, with which we are dealing here, commences about the year 1831, two years after the passing of the Emancipation Act. A system of primary education, called the National system, was then introduced. "Its object and fundamental principle" are given in Part I. of "Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland," in the following passage :—"The object of the system of national education is to afford *combined* literary and moral, and *separate* religious instruction, to children of all persuasions, as far as possible, in the same school, upon the fundamental principle, that no attempt shall be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian pupils." The proposal had a fair appearance, and it can scarcely be necessary to say that the Irish Catholics, just emerged from the oppression and restrictions of a penal code, joyously and generally availed of it. It gained rapidly on the country and soon came to be not only in name but in effect the national system of education. Its very success engendered alarm in the minds of some amongst the prelates, and it could not be denied that it contained fundamentally elements of possible mischief for Catholicity. The Board, with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant, could do almost anything they pleased with it. Clauses 4 and 5 of the Rules and Regulations (Part I., par. 1), when looked well into were found to have an alarming significance. "4. The Commissioners will not change any fundamental rule *without the express permission of his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant.* 5. The Commissioners will not withdraw, or essentially alter any book, that has been, or shall be hereafter, unanimously published or sanctioned by them, *without a previous communication with the Lord-Lieutenant.*" The fixity and continuous moral identity of the system thus rested entirely with the Lord-Lieutenant. The Bishops discussed the matter amongst themselves on several occasions in their yearly synods and finally, in the year 1839, referred the question to the Holy See for solution. A beautiful lesson of prudence and moderation comes to us in the response, which was directed to each of the Irish Metropolitans under date January 16th, 1841.

The importance of the subject involved in the controversy lately arisen in Ireland in reference to the so-called national system for the

education of youth, is, as your Grace well knows, so great, that you cannot wonder that the response of the Sacred Congregation "de Propaganda Fide" has been delayed so long. . . .

It had to consider long and anxiously, as its institute demands, in the question proposed, the security of the Catholic religion, the advantages of education for the young, the duty of making a grateful return to the senate of the British Empire, who had devoted a large amount of money to the support of schools for the Irish people, the necessity of upholding concord amongst Catholic bishops, the obligation of promoting public tranquillity, finally the apprehension that the entire sum of money granted, and the entire management of the system might pass into the hands of heterodox teachers.

All the risks and advantages of the system having been carefully weighed, having heard the arguments on both sides, and particularly having obtained the pleasing information that for the ten years that it has been in operation, the Catholic religion has suffered nothing from the system, the Sacred Congregation, with the approval of our Most Holy Father, Gregory XVI., has concluded that no definite judgment is to be pronounced on the case, and that this kind of education is to be left to the prudent judgment and religious conscience of the bishops, inasmuch as the success of such a system must depend on the vigilant care of the pastors, on the use of various cautionary measures, and finally on the experience which will come with time.

The practical adjustment of the controversy brought satisfaction to the minds of prelates and people, and the national system watched over by the Catholic pastors in accordance with the direction of the Pontiff has been made the instrument of immense temporal benefit to the people, and of some considerable advantage to religion also. There remain still, however, a few flaws in its administration, especially in reference to religious teachers, so unmeaning and illogical, that one wonders how men of the high status of the National Commissioners can allow themselves to be even passively responsible for them.

The next appeal of the Irish Bishops to Rome marks the next move in the matter of education for Ireland. The mixed system, as they wish to call it, having so far succeeded in the schools, it was thought possible and advisable to extend the same to the colleges of an university. Accordingly the scheme of a new university, with three colleges for the three provinces of Munster, Ulster, and Connaught attached to it, under the title of the Queen's University and Queen's Colleges, was devised and soon carried into effect. A greater divergence of opinion than had existed on the national education system then arose amongst the prelates. Some discovered a wide difference between the management of a children's school, in which reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, a little of geometry, and the rudiments of algebra would form the staple of the

education, and the controlling within religious limits of the chairs of history, geology, physiology, and other branches in which infidelity had of late so audaciously interwoven itself with science. Others believed that by a sharp clerical supervision, and the appointment of approved Catholic professors to the dangerous chairs, or at least by a right of veto or protest against recognised infidel candidates, the system of education of the Queen's Colleges might be made practically safe for the faith and morals of the students, and as available for Catholic aspirants to higher education as the national system had proved for the lower. The decision arrived at by the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and approved by Pius IX., inclined to the former view, and was forwarded to the Irish Bishops on the 9th of October, 1847. It premises that the delay in replying to the questions put by the Irish Bishops arose from the anxiety of the Fathers to examine fully the proofs and documents advanced on either side, and, in a matter so momentous as the question of higher education for the Irish people, to await until they should find themselves secure in the judgment they would pronounce. It then proceeds:—

One thing, however, before all others, we feel bound to declare—that the Sacred Congregation did not for a moment think that the prelates, who appeared to favour the establishment of the colleges, had not a righteous purpose in the part they took; for a long experience has given it ample proof of their sincerity; and it feels convinced that it was the expectation of securing a great benefit, and the belief that they were consulting for the prosperity of religion in Ireland, that induced them to adopt the views they have put forward. Nevertheless, the Sacred Congregation having considered the subject maturely and in all respects, cannot venture to promise itself the favourable results that are contemplated to follow from the establishment of those colleges; it rather apprehends from them grave danger to the Catholic Faith. In a word, it considers an institution of the kind an existing injury to religion. Wherefore it wishes to admonish the archbishops and bishops of Ireland that they are to have no part in the carrying out of it. . . . What has been said should not, however, prevent any of you, who may have something further of graver moment to propose, from frankly submitting it to the Sacred Congregation, in order that the question may, in all its bearings, be duly adjudicated on. The decision of the Congregation was in due course submitted to the Holy Father, who, after having obtained accurate information on the whole question, judged that it was worthy of his approval, and added to it the supreme force of his authority.

The prelates who were in favour of a toleration of the Queen's College scheme, to whose probity and sincerity of purpose the Sacred Congregation bears such strong testimony, did again submit the grounds of their belief, and hoping thereby to calm

in some degree the fears of the Fathers placed before them several statutes, deemed to be of a protective nature for the Catholic students, that had been sanctioned by the Government. Their fears were not removed, for a letter, dated October 11, 1848, is sent forward to the Irish Episcopate, in which, "All things being fully considered, the Sacred Congregation could not, on account of the grave and intrinsic dangers of the said colleges, moderate the decision already given by it, and approved by the Holy Father, and communicated to the four Irish Metropolitans the previous October."

At the Synod of Thurles, held in the summer of 1850, the final attempt to get the question reconsidered by the Congregation, in order to a more modified pronouncement thereon, was made, and without effect; for in the chapter "*de Collegiis Reginæ*" we read as follows:—

Recognising and venerating as we do in the Roman Pontiff the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the Successor of St. Peter, on whom was conferred by God the office of instructing the faithful in sound doctrine, and keeping them away from pestiferous and poisonous pastures, we, with willing mind and all becoming submission, assent to the admonitions and rescripts regarding the Queen's Colleges recently erected amongst us, which rescripts have been confirmed by the authority of the Vicar of Christ, and communicated to us by the Sacred Congregation "*de Propaganda Fide*."

Thenceforward all share in, or sanction or approval of the colleges of the Queen in Ireland, was scrupulously avoided by priests and bishops. The divided counsels were at an end.

Two systems of education, both mixed, both constructed on the same principles, have thus met with very opposite treatment at the hands of the Roman Congregation of Cardinals "*de Fide Propaganda*." To men considering the subject superficially this has the appearance of inconsistency, and the imputations of inconsistency, illiberality, and tyranny are freely made against Rome, and of inconsistency and subserviency against the Irish Episcopate. Leading journals, in the exercise of their infallible censorship, pass sentence of condemnation upon both; and, unfortunately, Catholics, sound at the core, but of faulty vision from the regular study of heterodox literature, follow in their wake. To the disciplined Catholic mind the different solutions given to the two questions do not offer the smallest difficulty. Both were arrived at by the just application of plain and unquestionable theological principles, which, for the better elucidation of the matter, it may be well for us to introduce at this point.

Theologians distinguish between *peccatum* and the *occasio*

peccati. S. Alphonsus Liguori,* about the middle of the section, says—

The occasion of sinning is not in itself a sin, nor does it involve the necessity of sinning : wherefore there may co-exist with it a real detestation of sin, and a firm purpose of not relapsing and of applying the necessary remedies. The *occasio peccati* is divided into *proxima* and *remota*. Men, as a rule, do not sin from being placed in the *occasio remota*. Men, as a rule, do sin from being placed in the *occasio proxima*.† The *occasio* is again divided into *voluntary* and *necessary*. *Voluntary* is that occasion which can be easily removed ; *necessary* is that which it is either physically or morally out of our power to remove.

The *occasio* is bad on account of, and in proportion to, the *danger* of sinning that is involved in it, and this *danger*, when found in the *occasio proxima*, is still subdivided by the same authority, (and we may observe that S. Alphonsus is giving only the ordinary approved teaching of the schools), into *formal* and *material*.

The *formal danger* is that which is so closely connected with sin, that a person in such danger will probably sin or consent to sin. The *material danger* is that which is not closely connected with sin, but only remotely, through the application of the means necessary for the avoidance of sin, and the necessity of the circumstances in which the individual is placed. Hence it will happen in such case that the *occasio* may be of itself *proxima* and the danger only *material*.

Now, this question of mixed education is altogether a question of *occasio peccandi*, proximate or remote, of *periculum peccati*, *formale*, or *materiale*. The individuals to be admitted into the occasion and danger are not capable of taking due care of themselves. They are children in the dawn of reason, and youths just ripening into intelligence, and woe to their pastors if these little ones believing in Him, through their want of vigilance, suffer scandal ! It is their imperative duty to see whether the occasions and dangers of the education to which they are invited can be made remote, and if this can be effected, then the advantages to be derived from the proffered system may be admitted as a reason for its acceptance. But if this cannot be effected, no temporal consideration whatsoever can be allowed to weigh against the exposure to sin of those committed to their charge by God.

In the case of the national system the danger of sin arose, first, from the association of Catholic children with children of other religious beliefs for so many hours every day,

* *Lib. 6. Tract 4 de Pœnitentia, cap. 1, de contritione, Dub. 2, No. 455.*

† *Ibidem*, No. 452.

and in such close companionship as that of schoolmates. (Children, it is well known, are great teachers of one another.) Secondly, from the want of a religious training being incorporated with the work of teaching. The first source of danger was removed by the simple fact that, almost universally, the children of the national schools are exclusively of one religious denomination. The second was obviated by the vigilance of the priests, and, we must in justice add, by the fidelity of the Catholic teachers in imparting religious instruction to their pupils every day during the hour allowed by the Commissioners for the purpose. The Irish Bishops, on the occasions of visitation, find no better instructed children than those brought forward by the teachers of the national schools.

In the students of the Queen's Colleges the dangers to faith and morals increase, whilst the remedial or preventive measures become fewer or less effective. The subjects to be studied, the books to be read, possibly the professors to be attended, bring with them fresh, and for a time increasing, dangers to Catholic young men. The colleges are not numerically denominational, as the national schools have become. The young child with its tender mind, receiving its religious instruction without question or resistance, is a much more manageable disciple than the youth of ripening intelligence, with his curiosity, so often prurient, his tendency to question and to doubt, if he receive any encouragement thereto, and in all probability his self-conceit if he be at all above the average in his studies. Some of these dangers are, it may be said, incidental to all collegiate teaching. Doubtless this is so, but the great object and use of a Catholic collegiate system is to provide against them, to adopt the necessary means to change a proximate occasion of sinning into a remote one, to reduce a formal danger of sin to one that will be merely material. It was for this reason that the Holy See, even so far back as the letter of October, 1847, began to urge the Bishops of Ireland to renewed vigour in the promotion of Catholic collegiate education, and "to the establishment by their united efforts in Ireland of a Catholic Academia, on the principle of that erected by the Prelates of Belgium in Louvain." For this reason the Catholic University of Dublin has been upheld by the bishops, and subsidized by the people of Ireland, for well nigh thirty years, under circumstances of the greatest discouragement and opposition. The unanimous and persevering demand of the Catholics of Ireland for its recognition by the State, a demand, the sincerity of which was substantiated by their liberal and constant contributions for its support, demonstrated its necessity. The character of its staff of professors, unsurpassed by those of any other institution in the

country, in their respective departments, established its fitness, and yet not one of the many projected University Bills for Ireland, not even that of Mr. Gladstone, so mightily vaunted by some, dared to propose to relieve the Catholics of Ireland of the large tax which they have been for so many years levying on themselves for the support of a branch of public education that in equity should be supported by the State. One is reminded, as he considers these things, of the words of St. James: — “And if a brother or sister be naked, and want daily food, and one of you say to them, go in peace, be you warmed and filled, yet give them not those things that are necessary for the body, what shall it profit?”

The present Government, admitting in principle the justice of the Irish Catholic claim for an educational subsidy, or at least the expediency of acceding in some form to Catholic wishes, but, like the past ones, being afraid to undertake the responsibility of the *direct* granting of it, devised the Intermediate Education Act, through the operation of which some assistance might be *indirectly* extended to schools exclusively Catholic. The readiness with which the measure, *manca lex* as it was, was accepted by the Catholic Bishops proved that it was not difficult to satisfy them, and should have served as an earnest to the administration of a similar readiness on their part to accept any reasonable legislation on the University question. It is more than probable that it did serve as such with the leaders of the party in office, and that the University project, which they were dealing with tentatively in the beginning of the present year, was the result thereof. It is a painful position to be associated with clumsy fellow-workmen, in whom one can find no appreciation of his carefully and cunningly conceived design. Lord Beaconsfield seems to have some of the class about him.

The next phase of the Irish University controversy is the Bill of the O’Conor Don, now on trial for its life before the British House of Commons. Its provisions are few and simple and its demands moderate. A glance at its “Constitution” and the “Duties of its Senate” will enable us to understand it sufficiently for the purposes of the present Paper.

3. The said University shall consist—

(a.) Of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Senators hereinafter mentioned.

(b.) Of all persons who shall become matriculated students of the said University, and of all persons upon whom the Senate hereinafter mentioned shall hereafter confer degrees.

4. *Immediately after the passing of this Act* the Lord-Lieutenant

of Ireland shall appoint a fit and proper person to be the Chancellor of the said University, and another fit and proper person to be the Vice-Chancellor of said University.

5. The persons named in the First Schedule to this Act shall be the first Senators of the University.

6. The said Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor and the other said Senators shall form the first Senate of the University, and shall hold office during the pleasure of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. All vacancies in the Senate, except as hereinafter provided, shall be filled up by the Lord-Lieutenant, so that the number of the Senate shall consist of *twenty-four*.

13. It shall be the duty of the Senate to promote University education in Ireland, in the manner provided by this Act; that is to say,

- (b.) For appointing times and places at which examinations shall be held in each year :
- (c.) For defining the qualifications of the persons who may present themselves for examination :
- (d.) For defining the subjects and nature of the examinations and the length of the course necessary for obtaining degrees :
- (e.) For requiring candidates for examination to give such notice as the Senate may prescribe of their intention to present themselves for examination, and for fixing the fees to be paid by candidates upon such notices :
- (f.) For fixing the numbers and amounts of the exhibitions, scholarships, and fellowships which may be awarded in each year, and for declaring the conditions with respect to attendance at college, attendance at the examinations to be held under this Act, and the standard of merit, and conditions with respect to such other matters as the Senate may prescribe, upon compliance with which such exhibitions, scholarships, fellowships, and degrees may be obtained or held :
- (g.) For prescribing and satisfying themselves as to the observance of the conditions upon which heads of colleges may receive payment of result fees and the other advances of money hereinbefore provided for :
- (h.) For making proper provisions to carry out the rules in the schedule to this Act, and for varying, altering, and amending the rules contained in such schedule :
- (i.) Generally for carrying this Act into effect.

The questions called forth by the appearance of the Bill are, first: Do the Irish Bishops accept it? Do they accept it as a final settlement of their demand for University education?

Of their readiness to accept it there is no lack of evidence. That they do not and cannot recognize in it their ideal of an University for Catholics is also evident from their avowed principles and declarations on the subject. But why should the question be raised in reference to this measure in particular?

Is not all new legislation on large and important subjects of necessity experimental and consequently not final?

Secondly: Can the Irish Bishops, without violation of Catholic principle and surrender of the position they had taken up on a former occasion, accept the contemplated legislation?

In the University system are comprehended two functions totally distinct one from the other—the *function of training and teaching, and the function of examining*. The first is carried out in the colleges, the second in the University proper. The first they cannot consistently with Catholic principle allow out of their own control and management—hence the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges; if they have secured the first they can hold themselves permissively in regard to the second. In the Bill of the O'Connor Don the function of Catholic training and teaching is admirably secured, and the mixed system completely excluded. This and the indirect sustentation for Catholic teaching which it provides were wanting in the proposal of Mr. Gladstone, two very fundamental points of difference. In very truth the University scheme of the Premier of 1873, had it passed into law, would have been for the Catholic Colleges of Ireland a *damnosa donatio*.

Another branch of mixed education in Ireland, the model schools, bespeaks our attention before concluding this article. The nature of these schools is explained in "Rules and Regulations, Part III., par. 1."

1. District and minor model schools are built and supported entirely out of the funds placed by Parliament at the disposal of the Commissioners, and are therefore under their exclusive control.

2. The chief objects of the model schools are to promote united education; to exhibit the most approved methods of literary and scientific instruction to the surrounding schools, and to train young persons for the office of teacher.

3. In district and minor model schools the Commissioners appoint and dismiss, of their own authority, the teachers and other officers; regulate the course of instruction, and exercise all the rights of patrons.

The conditions and circumstances on account of which the Holy See tolerated, and the Irish Bishops accepted, the ordinary national schools are all absent here. The schools seemed to be framed as if with the express design of excluding them. From the educational advantages they hold out they will always, except in the very rare instance, of there being no Protestants, in the place, be frequented by Protestant children, and, should Catholic children be allowed to use them, will consequently be always practically mixed schools. The fact that the ordinary national schools are practically unmixed or deno-

minational schools, is the circumstance that keeps them in favour with the Catholic Prelates. Next, the prevalence of Catholic managership of schools in Catholic districts, with the vigilance over Catholic interests to be expected from it, is the principal means of allaying fears on a very obvious source of apprehension. In the model school scheme Catholic managership is completely set aside. Again, the Holy See suggested to the bishops, and the bishops sharply appreciated, the wisdom of keeping in their own hands the ownership of the schools frequented by Catholic children against the possible contingency of disagreement between the Episcopate and the Commissioners. Ownership in the model schools is reserved to the Commissioners themselves. When we add to all this that in the model schools the Commissioners "have exclusive control," that "they regulate the course of studies and exercise all the rights of patrons," we have said *satis superque* to show that model schools and Queen's Colleges have been justly regarded by the Sacred Congregation and dealt with by the Irish Episcopate as included in one and the same category. Bishop or priest can have no part in either. Bishops and priests are bound to admonish their flocks that in both grave and intrinsic dangers to faith and morals exist.

The latest pronouncement of Rome on mixed teaching is contained in an "Instruction of the Holy Office of January 17th, 1866, on Mixed Schools," with an extract or two from which the present Paper may be brought to a close. To the question proposed, "Whether it is lawful for parents to send their children for instruction to schools of this kind,"—the Most Eminent Fathers of the Congregation reply, "That it is to be most urgently impressed on all fathers of families that they can in no other way deserve worse of their offspring, of their country, or of the Catholic cause, than by exposing their children to this extreme risk." They then expatiate at length on the various dangers arising for Catholic children in mixed places of instruction, and afterwards lay down the conditions on which parents may be permitted to avail themselves of the system, at the same time peremptorily requiring that the said conditions be clearly and unmistakably present.

It is not, however, overlooked by the most eminent Fathers that certain peculiar combinations of affairs may bring about a necessity of sometimes regulating these schools, as, for instance, when Catholics are so oppressed that they have neither the way nor the means of getting at, or of having schools of their own, and are thus placed in the alternative of relinquishing altogether the educational subsidies necessary for their families, and leaving the entire management of public matters to the heterodox party, or submitting, no matter how unwillingly, to the system of the mixed schools. But although the Fathers, moved by this

consideration, are of opinion that access to mixed schools is not to be absolutely and unconditionally condemned, but that the case is to be left to the prudent judgment and religious conscience of the individual bishops, nevertheless, lest any person should deceive himself in a matter of so much importance, they wish to invite serious attention to two admonitions, the same that are given by all theologians when there is question of the *proximate, necessary occasion* of sin, first, that the bishops satisfy themselves that the alleged necessity is not a pretended, but a real necessity; secondly, that those whose duty it is, carefully apply all the means that may be efficacious in averting the danger of perversion.;

HENRY F. NEVILLE.

ART. VII.—THE EDUCATION QUESTION IN BELGIUM.

THE so-called Liberal Ministry whom the last elections, contrary to all expectation, raised to power in Belgium, has submitted to the Legislative Chambers a Bill on Primary Education—that is to say, on the education of the people—which is causing the liveliest excitement throughout the country. Under the specious pretext of preserving neutrality among all forms of religion, so as not to trench on freedom of conscience, this treacherous bill excludes from the programme of studies the sole true and solid basis of all good education—viz., religion. Schools without religion will produce only an atheistic generation, without principles and without morals. The bishops have, in two collective Pastoral letters, strongly protested against this mad attempt to un-Christianize Belgium. Whatever the newspapers devoted to the Ministry may say, this Bill deeply wounds the feelings of the nation. A vast petition to the Legislative Chambers demonstrates that in the country parts nearly all fathers of families, and in the towns the majority of them, abhor the proposed law, and regard it as an attack on their rights as fathers and their faith as Christians.

The Ministry, nevertheless, pushed on by the Masonic lodges, who are atheists in this country, persists in the desire to enforce their fatal Bill. We are threatened shortly with the spectacle of the revival of the ill-omened days which preceded 1830. The happy union which makes both our motto and our strength,* and which we gained at the cost of so many sacrifices, is on the point of being broken. Instead of celebrating next year in unity and joy the fiftieth anniversary of our emancipation and national existence, the nation, divided and torn, will celebrate it in strife

* The Belgian motto is, "L'Union fait la Force."

and mourning, unless the Senate, placing the salvation of the people above political passion, oppose an obstacle to the devastating torrent. Belgium, hitherto so happy, will see her children divided one against another by the imposition of a law which has been provoked by no abuse and which nothing can justify. For the motive of the proposed law is neither the need of amending existing laws nor the necessity of redressing abuses; but solely the wish to please the Masonic lodges and to satisfy certain freethinkers among the Deputies, who claim freedom of conscience for those only who have no conscience. It matters little to them that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews should be free to exercise their religion; they themselves must be free to have none, and to exclude Divine Providence from the government of the world.*

Before explaining the new Bill and the position in which it will place Catholics, we must cast a glance backwards to see what has been the condition and progress of education in Belgium since 1830.

The usurpations of the Government of the Low Countries in the domain of public instruction, the annoying measures introduced into the common schools, the establishment of a philosophical college at Louvain, imposed on Catholics against their faith—all these vexations were undoubtedly among the chief causes of the revolution of 1830. One of the first cares, therefore, of the National Congress was to inscribe on the charter of our political rights Freedom of Instruction—in order to prevent the return of similar abuses. Article 17 of the Constitution declares: "*Teaching is free*; every preventive measure is forbidden; the repression of offences is regulated by the law. Public instruction given at the cost of the State is equally regulated by law."

It follows from this that instruction in all its grades is completely free. *Primary* instruction, which is given in schools to the children of the people; *secondary* instruction, which forms youth to the study of the *belles lettres* in the *athénées*, colleges, and junior seminaries (*petits séminaires*); *superior* instruction, which prepares young men from the colleges for the liberal careers by the study of philosophy, law, the sciences, and medicine, in the four Universities of Brussels, Ghent, Liège, and Louvain; *theological* instruction, which forms priests, in the

* Our Liberals have gone as far as this. M. Frère, their leader, in order not to offend the liberty of conscience of Citizen Janson, Socialist advocate, Member for Brussels, consented that the mention of Divine Providence should be withdrawn from the Speech to the Throne at the opening of the Legislative Session in November last. What conscience can a man have who denies the existence of God?

senior seminaries (*grands séminaires*), in religious houses, and at the University of Louvain; all these different grades of teaching are equally free, whether given by the State or by individuals.

No hindrance can be offered to it: no preventive measure can strike it. Every corporation, every private person can erect, open, and conduct establishments of instruction without the Government being able, under any pretext, to oppose the enterprise. The civil power cannot meddle in private instruction under pretext of surveillance or of abuse: it has no right except to check offences.

The State enjoys rights equally with individuals: it can establish, at its own cost, institutes of public instruction. It has made use of this right in creating the Universities of Ghent and Liège for superior instruction, and in establishing ten royal *athénées* and various colleges for teaching the humanities. Further on we shall see what it has done for primary education. As the learned Professor Thonissen has well noted in his remarkable work on the Belgian Constitution,* in certain circumstances it may be necessary that the Government should establish schools to supply for the insufficiency of private ones. Where they are not a necessity such schools may be useful by the competition which they provoke. Free competition stimulates personal interest, introduces variety and the comparison of methods, develops the sciences, rouses emulation under all its forms, and so furnishes the elements of a real and durable progress. But, on the other hand, it is certain that the State runs counter to the wish of the National Congress and mistakes its constitutional mission if it draws lavishly from the coffers of the State treasury for unnecessary establishments, and renders the competition of free education impossible. The Congress did not intend this: the article before quoted says so plainly, and the discussions which preceded are a proof of it.† In reality, would it not be a mere sham to proclaim education free, and to take away from individuals all possibility of competing with the State? Besides, the mission of the State is not to substitute itself for its citizens, not to concentrate in its own hands all their

* *La Constitution Belge annotée*, p. 64. Bruxelles, 1876.

† When, in 1835, the first Law on Universities was discussed, the Central Section, composed of the old Members of the National Congress, said:—"The Central Section rejects the principle which gives the mission of teaching to the State, because the liberty of instruction proclaimed by the Constitution, instead of being the rule, will be no more than a feeble accessory which Governmental action will soon absorb. The Central Section thinks that if Government action in public education exist at all, it should only be to *fill up the blank* which may be left by liberty—too young as yet to have had time to reconstruct everything."

rights, their personal duties, their activity, but solely to help, to protect the work of their intellectual, physical, and moral progress. It must not, therefore, offer a ruinous opposition to private initiative. Yet it is this which the Government seems to wish to do at present for the primary schools, as we shall see further on.

As soon as the Constitution had been voted and peace re-established, the Catholics hastened to avail themselves of the liberty which had been granted them by our fundamental pact, by erecting establishments of instruction in all its branches. *Petits séminaires* were organized by the bishops in all the dioceses for the teaching of the humanities to the young levites, and to others whom their parents wished to confide to them. Besides these smaller seminaries a certain number of episcopal colleges were erected, according to need and means.

The Jesuit Fathers joined their efforts to those of the secular clergy and established large and fine colleges in which almost the whole of the Belgian nobility is formed to the study of *belles lettres* during the six or seven years of the humanity course. We can now count in Belgium ten *petits séminaires*, twenty-two episcopal colleges, eleven colleges directed by the Jesuits, and three by the Josephites, besides institutes for commerce, the so-called middle schools, and the boarding-schools where the classics are not taught. All these establishments are completely organized, enjoy the confidence of parents, and so successfully compete with the *athénées*, colleges, and other Government and town schools, that the educational establishments of the clergy train in humanities more than three-quarters of the youth of Belgium.

The Law of 1850 organized, under the name of "middle education," the teaching of *athénées*, colleges, and schools called "middle," erected by the State and the Communes. The Episcopal Colleges, directed by secular priests but adopted and subsidized by the Communes and provinces, are subject to the same law. The other ecclesiastical establishments—colleges, *petits séminaires* or boarding schools, arrange their programme of studies in full liberty. It is to be remarked that the establishments of the clergy do not enjoy what we call civil "personality." They are private property; the law does not otherwise recognize them. Gifts made to them directly are reputed legally null. The judges, in cases which have arisen on the subject, have shown themselves severe to a degree which the English would consider contrary to equity.

In all the establishments, both of the clergy and of the State, the humanity studies occupy six years. Scholars whose early instruction is not sufficiently developed make a preparatory year called the *septième*. It is not necessary to remark that religion

forms the basis of all instruction and education in the establishments of the clergy. Those of the Government are, in this respect, very deficient, and it is this which enfeebles them and takes away confidence in them. Nevertheless, the law of 1850 sets down religious teaching in the programme of studies. The greater part of the colleges and *athénées* have adopted the "Convention of Antwerp," entered into, in 1852, by the Cardinal of Mechlin and the Government, in virtue of which a Catholic priest is attached to each college to give religious instruction. "Dissenters" (*Les dissidents*) are dispensed from attendance at these instructions. Recently, some large towns, directed by the Masonic lodges, have suppressed the course of religion and sent away the priest.

At the same time that they organized colleges and schools of every kind, the bishops bethought themselves also of profiting by the liberty granted, to found a house of superior instruction. In 1834 they erected, with the authorization of Pope Gregory XVI., the University of Louvain, comprising five faculties: theology, law, medicine, letters, and science. There have since been added a normal school of humanities for the clergy, special schools of engineering, and a school of agriculture.

On the other side, the Masonic lodges have profited by the 17th Article of the Constitution, to erect a Free University at Brussels, intended to combat Catholic doctrines and to oppose the University of Louvain. The State, on its side, has organized two Universities, one at Ghent, the other at Liège.

The beginnings of the Universities of Louvain were modest; it grew speedily, and by its discipline, by the solidity of its studies, and the reputation of its professors, it gained the confidence of parents, to such a degree, that at the present day it counts 1350 students—as many as the two State Universities together, and twice as many as the Free University of Brussels, in spite of the fact that this last is placed in the Capital with its large population. The notorious impiety of some of the professors of the State Universities has contributed not a little to bring discredit on their teaching.

The Law of the 20th May, 1876, regulated the granting of Academic Degrees. Each university has the power of subjecting its pupils to examinations, conformably to a programme fixed by the law, and of conferring Academic Degrees. There is a "central jury" before which all students, without distinction, may present themselves to be examined and to obtain degrees. Degrees, in order to have legal effect, must be "ratified" by a Special Commission named by the Government, which inquires whether the diplomas have been granted regularly after due examination and on the conditions required by the law.

The education of Girls could not escape the solicitude of the Church, which has reinstated woman, and which appreciates the important rôle which she fills in the family. Excellent boarding schools have been erected in the towns and their suburbs by the numerous teaching religious communities in Belgium. Young women there receive a careful education, and are formed to the knowledge and the virtues proper to their sex. The higher education of these young people may be said to be entirely in the hands of Religious : for there is only an insignificant number of lay institutions occupied with it, and those only in the large towns.

At all times, and among all peoples, the Catholic Church has watched with jealous care over the education of young children. On the training of children often depends both their later life and their eternal salvation. The Church has always required that religion should be the basis of all education, but particularly of the education of the young.

An education,* writes Pius IX.,* which is not only occupied with nothing but the science of natural things and the ends of earthly society, but which, still more, withdraws itself from the truths revealed by God, inevitably falls under the yoke of the spirit of error and falsehood, and an education which pretends to form the minds and hearts of young people of a nature so tender and susceptible of being turned to evil, and to form them without the aid of Christian doctrine and morality, must of necessity produce a race delivered over without bridle to bad passions and to the pride of reason ; and the generations thus brought up cannot but prepare for the family and the State the greatest calamities.

But if this detestable method of education, separated from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, is a source of evils for individuals and for society, when there is question of the training in letters and science of the higher classes of society, in public schools, who cannot see that the same method will produce still more deadly results when it is applied to elementary schools. It is chiefly in these schools that the children of the people of all conditions ought from their tenderest years to be carefully instructed in the mysteries and the precepts of our holy religion, and diligently formed to piety, to moral integrity, to religion, and honesty of life. In these schools religious doctrine ought to have the first place in everything which concerns either instruction or training.

That religion ought to be the foundation of education is indicated by common sense, and has been admitted by the most distinguished politicians of France, Germany, and England. Teaching based on religion is the first means of civilization ; it has made Europe what it now is. Without religion, teaching

* Letter of Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Freiburg, 14th July, 1864.

easily becomes a danger. Those who imagine that to render men virtuous and honest it suffices to dissipate their ignorance, are singularly in error. And they will soon be persuaded of their error if they will study the statistics of prisons.

A Protestant, M. Guizot, said to the Chamber of Deputies in 1833—

It is necessary that the general atmosphere of a school be religious; education is here our concern rather than instruction. Religious instruction mixes with the whole body of instruction, with all the acts of the master and of the children. . . . Gentlemen, remember a fact which has perhaps never shone out so evidently as in our own time: intellectual development when united with moral and religious development is excellent; but intellectual development alone, separated from moral and religious, becomes the source of pride, insubordination, egoism, and by consequence of danger to society.

M. Cousin defended the same thesis in the Report addressed to M. de Montalivet, Minister of Public Instruction in France—

Education must be moral and religious if it is desired to make it useful to the people and to society; this point touches on the dearest interests of humanity. It would be absurd to wish to give *moral and religious instruction* in schools without introducing *the clergy* into them. You, Sir, thanks be to God, are too enlightened, too much a statesman, to fancy that we can have true popular instruction without morality, or popular morality without religion, or religion without a form of worship. Christianity must be the basis of the people's education, we should never shrink from avoiding this doctrine; to do so is as politic as it is honest. I write to you from Berlin, and not from Rome. And he who speaks to you is a philosopher who has been before now misunderstood and even persecuted by the clergy.

Jouffroy added to this: "Without religion no moral education is possible." Our statesmen appeal to France; but they forget what M. Ernoul, Chairman of the Committee on Primary Instruction, said in 1872—

Ought education to be religious? Even to propose the question seriously would be to despair of our civilization and of the future of our country. Instruction cannot be separated from education, nor can there be education without morals and religion. Instruction is a power and an instrument which must be entrusted to honest hands, a light which ought to direct the soul of the child and incline it towards the eternal source of the good, the true, and the beautiful.

Need we add the testimony of an Emperor, venerable for age, power, and success on the battle-field? Showing his arm, wounded by German Socialism, to the first Magistrates of his Capital, the Emperor William said: "Secure to your children a religious education: it is the price of security." I will say nothing of English statesmen; the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW know

their sentiments. Its April number contained an article devoted to the Law on Elementary Instruction.

The Belgian clergy—like all the men of 1830—profoundly imbued with these ideas, turned its attention from the First to the Primary Schools. In 1830, after the vexations of the Government of Holland, popular instruction was in a very sad condition. Many places had no school; the buildings were insufficient and unwholesome; besides, the teachers were neither sufficiently capable nor sufficiently trained; and the schools were badly attended. The clergy set themselves to work: they built and opened schools on all sides. The Christian Brothers and other congregations of men and women were formed for the purpose of devoting themselves to teaching and education. But private initiative was not sufficient for all educational wants. The State intervened, according to the spirit of the Constitution, not to destroy, as is the desire at present, but to second private efforts and to give a greater impulse to the teaching of youth. The Communes adopted the schools of the Brothers and Religious, the Government came in with subsidies. Some years later the Government thought it opportune to give a still more active impulse. This led to that wise Law of 1842, which—thanks chiefly to the efforts of the clergy—has rendered primary education so flourishing in Belgium; a law carried almost unanimously in both the Legislative Chambers; a law praised by King Leopold I., himself a Protestant; a law against which no religious confession has ever appealed; a law which has been maintained by all the Ministers, Liberals as well as Catholics, who have succeeded each other from 1842 to the present day; a law, finally, which merited such high eulogium for the Belgian Government, last year, at the Paris Exhibition. This is the law which the Ministry who at this moment govern us wish to abolish, in order to please a few freethinkers, full of contempt for the people, who force their own wishes on the Government.* To this end they do not fear to sacrifice the desires of five millions of Catholics to the caprices of twenty thousand free thinkers, and to tear to pieces the Union of 1830 at the moment of celebrating its fiftieth anniversary.

Education is one of those many-sided matters which in canonical language are called *mixed*; it concerns, at the same time,

* M. Laurent, professor at the University of Ghent, one of the strong minds of the party, in the April number of the *Revue de Belgique*, is not content to accuse the manufacturing classes of profound ignorance and to menace them with compulsory teaching; he styles them "*sauvages*," "*barbares*," "*canaille*." This is Voltaire over again. "The people," said that great enemy of religion, "is nothing but a herd of oxen for which you need a yoke, a goad, and hay."

the spiritual and the civil order, the Church and the State. The Church—because it is an instrument for the salvation of souls : the State—because it is an element in temporal prosperity and in human progress. Instruction, given as it ought to be, is the grand means of civilization ; just as it becomes the source of the greatest evils when perverted.

In modern societies where freedom of conscience and worship exists, the education question is one of the most complex, and the most difficult of solution. For the point is to determine what portion of authority belongs to each power. In theory, this division of rights may not appear very difficult ; in practice, education cannot proceed without clashing, unless there is an understanding between Church and State—an understanding easy enough in itself to come to, but which political passions and the efforts of irreligion incessantly tend to frustrate. The Law of 1842 resolved, for Belgium, this difficult problem to the common advantage of the two powers. The principal provisions of this law are as follows:—In each commune in the kingdom there is to be at least one primary school, established in a convenient place ; but in case of necessity, two or more neighbouring communes may be authorized to join together in founding or supporting a school. When the requirements of primary education are sufficiently provided for in any locality by private schools, the commune may be dispensed from establishing a school itself. The commune can be authorized to adopt, in the same locality, one or more private schools, which accept the legal conditions required in a communal school. The commune is bound to find gratuitous instruction for all poor children whose parents apply for it, whether in a communal school or in that which holds its place, or in some other school specially designated by it for that effect.

Thanks to the united efforts of the Government and the clergy, there is at present scarcely a commune which has not its school, either communal or *adopted*. All communes where the population is sufficiently numerous have separate schools for the two sexes. The following, according to the last Triennial Report, was the number of Primary Schools in Belgium in 1875 :—

The number of Primary Schools of every description ("Communal," "Adopted," "Private, subject to inspection," "Private, entirely free," "Primary boarding-schools") was 5857. Of this number, 4661 schools were subject to inspection, and consequently organized conformably to the law of 1842, and 1196 entirely free. The free schools, equally with the "adopted" schools, are all the creation of Catholic charity. There are no exceptions save only one small school erected at Brussels by a Freethought Society, called "*Ligue de l'enseignement*," and four Sectarian Schools for "Dissenters" (Anglicans, Protestants,

Jews). The number of schools is divided thus: 2127 schools for girls, 1766 for boys; 1904 mixed for both sexes; 457 schools are "adopted;" 958 private schools are entirely free, depending on the Government neither for the nomination of teachers nor for support, nor in their interior discipline; 270 Primary boarding-schools, 32 of which are subject to inspection and 238 entirely free. The teaching staff for these various schools amounted in 1875 to 11,863 masters and mistresses, lay and religious. Of this number 5778 are legally certificated, and of these 5524 are attached to Communal Schools.

The inspectors of the Flemish provinces report a great dearth of certificated masters in those parts. The scarcity will doubtless become infinitely greater if the new Bill is voted into law. On the contrary, there continues to be a superabundance of candidate teachers, and particularly of certificated mistresses, in the Walloon provinces. It is in evidence that, in the month of July, 1875, there were vacancies for 155 masters and mistresses in the Primary Communal Schools of the Flemish provinces, in consequence of the want of candidates with the necessary testimonials of capacity. The default was chiefly in assistant masters (*sous-instituteurs*).

The Law of 14th August, 1873, authorized a special loan of twenty millions of francs (800,000*l.*) for the building and furnishing of school houses. This gave a great impetus to school building. We may even say that in more than one case too much money was spent. The number of children frequenting Primary Schools had risen, in December, 1875, to 669,192, in a population (in Belgium) of 5,403,006 inhabitants. To this number must be added children who receive instruction at home, in apprenticeship, &c. So that there are scarcely any children who do not receive primary instruction.

Besides Primary Schools, there were in December, 1875, 929 *gardiennes* schools for children under six or seven years of age. In these schools there were nearly a hundred thousand children. Schools for *adults*, at the same date, numbered 2615, of which 1623 were communal, and 992 private. The pupils of these latter far exceed in number those of the communal schools. The *gardiennes* and adult schools are not regulated by the Law of 1842—they scarcely existed at that epoch; they are subject to later regulations drawn up in the same spirit. The total expenditure for primary education, which in 1843 did not exceed 2,651,639 francs, had risen, in 1875, to the sum of 24,806,428 francs—an increase of twenty-two millions of francs.*

* All these details are taken from the last Triennial Report on the State of Primary Education in Belgium, presented to the Legislative Chambers by M. Delcour, Minister of the Interior. Brussels, 1877.

To return to the Law of 1842. It regulates teaching as follows :—

Primary instruction *necessarily* includes the teaching of *religion and morals*, reading, writing, the legal system of weights and measures, the elements of arithmetic, and (according to the needs of the locality) the elements of the French, Flemish, or German languages. The religious and moral teaching is given under the direction of the ministers of the religion professed by the majority of the scholars in a school. Children not belonging to the religious communion of the majority are dispensed from attendance at religious teaching. It is to be remarked that in the country districts, except in four communes of Corinage, all the scholars belong to the Catholic religion. In the large towns, there are Communal Schools for “Dissenters.”

The supervision of schools, as to instruction and administration, is exercised by communal authority and by inspectors. As regards religious and moral teaching, the supervision belongs to the ministers of religion. The books intended for primary instruction are approved by the Government, except books exclusively used for religious instruction, which are approved by the religious authorities only. Reading books used for primary and religious instruction at the same time are submitted for the approbation of both the Government and religious superiors.

In order to justify the new Bill which excludes religion from the programme of studies, it has been pretended that the Law of 1842 created *neutral* and not *creed* schools. This is a manifest error. The provisions which we have just sketched prove it to demonstration, but as the pretence is insisted on, we will make the point still clearer.

The programme of studies includes religion as of necessity, and religion here is not vague doctrine without exact dogma; not indeterminate, universal, independent morality, variable at pleasure, according to the caprice of reason; it is a positive doctrine, a determinate worship, the worship of the majority of the scholars—that is to say, Catholic worship, for all schools except a few where the majority is Protestant. Only, it is added—as it ought to be in a country of freedom of conscience—that the “dissentients” are dispensed from assisting at such religious teaching. Article 6 says this formally. Its exact words are—

Primary instruction includes, necessarily, religious and moral teaching. . . . The religious and moral teaching is given under the direction of the ministers of the worship which the majority of scholars in the school profess. Children who do not belong to the religious communion of the majority in the school shall be dispensed from assisting at this teaching.

These words would appear to need no comment. But as our adversaries insist, we add—

The principal author of the Law, M. T. B. Nothoms, Minister of the Interior at that time, and Member of the National Congress, expressed himself as follows on Article 6 :—

No primary education without moral and religious education. And we understand by religious education the teaching of a positive religion. *We are all agreed on this principle.* It is our point of departure. We break—and we must say it, and say it aloud—we break with the political doctrines of the eighteenth century which pretended to completely secularize education, and to constitute society on bases purely rationalistic. . . . By whom shall religion be taught? It can only be by the ministers of religion or under their direction; they alone are competent in such an affair; the civil authority left to itself would be competent only for primary instruction strictly so called, if, indeed, primary instruction could be isolated. We are in this way led to invoke the intervention of the clergy. Elsewhere the civil authority may show itself distrustful; inscribe on your banners *le prêtre hors des affaires*; but here you are forced to have recourse to the priest; you have need of him; primary education as to religion is essentially his affair.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Bill, M. A. Dechamps, the brother of our present Cardinal, is not less categorical :—

The *public* school, founded at the expense of the ratepayers, to be constitutional must not be hostile to the feelings of the populations themselves. Now we know of both Protestant localities and Jewish localities, but we do not know of rationalistic or atheistic localities. The school which should leave out religious teaching would evidently be a rationalistic school, and the State which founded such a school would offend liberty of conscience and liberty of worship. . . . Rationalistic schools may exist without doubt, but they will be private schools supported by those who are willing to send their children to such teachers. Liberty of education exists; such persons may avail themselves of it. But they may not go so far as to pretend that the Commune, the Province, or the Government, can create at the expense of the majority an education which wounds all religions at once.

The most authoritative voices among the Liberals say the same thing. “We are *all agreed* on this point,” said M. Dolez. And M. Lebeau adds—“I do not hesitate to reply that I shall regard an *anti-religious primary teacher as a pest.*”*

What we have just said abundantly suffices to demonstrate the religious (*confessional*) character of the law of 1842. But since M. Rolin, the Minister of the Interior, has officially

* See other testimonies in a *brochure*, “Réponse à la Circulaire Ministérielle du 8 Mars, 1879.” Authentic Documents published under the auspices of Card. Dechamps. Mechlin, Dessain, 1879.

announced the contrary in all the communes of Belgium, and sent a circular to all electors, in which the Government speaks to the same effect, and strives to prove that there has been, for thirty-seven years, universal misconception of the character of this law, we would rather give a superabundance of proofs.

For the carrying out of Article VI. of the Law of 1842, M. le Comte de Theux, then Minister of the Interior, published on the 16th August, 1846, a Regulation sanctioned by the King, in which we read :—" Art. 14. The religious and moral lessons, in schools where the majority of scholars profess the Catholic religion, are to be given during the first half-hour in the morning, and in the evening during the last half-hour of the classes. Art. 15. Classes are to commence and end with prayer said in common. Art. 16. Moral and religious teaching shall be earnestly attended to. The teacher shall make it the object of his assiduous care. He will zealously make use of occasions which present themselves unceasingly for developing religious and moral principles. Art. 17. The Catholic teacher will follow, for these three Articles, the direction emanating from the Bishops, in virtue of Art. 6 of the Law. Art. 18. Teachers shall conform themselves as to the method to be employed in religious and moral teaching, to the instructions addressed by the Bishops of Belgium to their clergy, a copy of which is annexed hereto." In these instructions we read :—

Art. 1. Religious and moral teaching include three parts: the ordinary prayers of a Christian, the abridgment of Christian Doctrine contained in the Catechism of the diocese, and Sacred History both of the Old and the New Testament. Art. 5. It is very important that, besides this, the teacher should avail himself of the ordinary reading lessons, to prepare the child for understanding the text of the Catechism and Sacred History. Art. 11. The teacher shall make it a duty to inculcate to his scholars an inviolable attachment to the institutions of the country, an entire devotion to the public good, and a sincere love for the august dynasty which governs us. Art. 21. He will have a care to give to his school a religious appearance (*une physionomie religieuse*) which will exercise a salutary influence over the hearts of the children, and will powerfully help the master to work out their education. To this end he will place in the most conspicuous place in the school, where the children can see them, a Crucifix and an image of the Blessed Virgin.

We find the same spirit in the regulations of the Law of 1842, which concern the inspection of schools, and the training of teachers in the Normal Schools. This remains to be shown, in order to make the Law known in its entirety.

The nomination of Communal teachers is made by the Communal Council from among the candidates who show that they

have followed profitably, during at least two years, the courses at one of the State Normal Schools,* or the courses of a private Normal School which has been for at least two years under inspection. The number of Normal establishments for the training of primary masters and mistresses was thirty-eight in 1875. Since then the number has been augmented by one Normal School for masters at Bruges, and another at Mons, and by several private Normal Schools accepted by the Government. There were, in 1875, for the training of masters, two State Normal Schools, both directed by priests of known capacity, whom our new Minister of Public Instruction churlishly dismissed on the 1st of January last, without being able to excuse his violent and unjust act by any complaint. There were, besides, five Normal sections annexed to Middle Schools, and eight Normal Schools accepted. Two of these "accepted" Normal Schools have been founded and directed by the Christian Brothers; five belong to the secular clergy; one—that of Brussels—erected in 1874, was confided to lay persons, and does not offer the guarantees which are to be found up to the present in the State Normal Schools and in those of the clergy.

The Law of 1842 requires that there shall be in all Normal Schools a minister of religion,† whose office it is to teach morality and religion. This ordinance remains in force until the application of the new law with which we are threatened.

There were, for the training of female teachers, in 1875, one State Normal School in Liège, inaugurated the same year, and twenty-two Normal Schools adopted by the State, nearly all erected and governed by religious women, and subject to the Law of 1842.

The course of studies in all these Normal Schools lasts three years, and the programme of studies is so comprehensive that it exceeds the mental powers of students who possess only moderate abilities. The State grants burses, and exemption from military service, to students of the Normal Schools, on condition that they engage to serve the Government as teachers for five years. This is a point which the Bishops will doubtless take into account in the practical measures which their zeal and prudence will dictate to them in opposition to the new law.

* With the Normal Schools are classed the Superior Primary Schools, and the Middle Schools founded and supported by the Government with the help of the Communes, where the Normal "courses" have been adopted in such schools. There may be a Superior Primary School for each official *arrondissement*. In default of certificated teachers, the Communes are authorized to choose fit subjects under certain conditions.

† Up to the present time there are none but ministers of the Catholic religion.

The number of Government certificates granted in the various Primary Normal Schools, from the date of their institution to the 31st of December, 1875, amounts to 5868 for masters, and to 3000 for mistresses. The greater number of these certificates belong to clerical establishments. Certificates awarded by clerical establishments cost the State very little money, whilst the State Schools demand heavy budgets. For example, a master's certificate at Malonne (a clerical establishment) costs 512f., whilst at Nivelles (a State training-school) it costs 2117f. Yet these are the establishments which the proposed Law blots out with a stroke of the pen, although no abuse, no grievance, has afforded a pretence for it—unless it be the hatred which our new Statesmen have sworn against the clergy and their establishments.*

The expenses of primary education are defrayed by the Communes. The Province and the State give aid if there be occasion—which is nearly always the case with Communal Schools—by awarding grants.† Poor children receive gratuitous education. The Communal authorities exercise supervision over these schools with respect to teaching and administration. As to the teaching of religion and morality, supervision is exercised by delegates of the religious authorities. Ministers of religion and the said delegates have the right to inspect the school any time they please. The Law appoints cantonal and provincial Civil Inspectors to visit the schools. Ecclesiastical Inspectors have the right of assisting at the quarterly conferences of the teachers assembled under the presidency of the provincial or cantonal Inspector, and to preside over these meetings in matters appertaining to moral and religious education. The Bishops are represented on the Central Commission of Primary Instruction by the Diocesan Inspectors. The Consistories of other religious bodies can likewise depute their delegates.

Such are the principal provisions of the Law which has regulated Primary Education in Belgium since 1842 to the present time, and which, thanks to the good understanding that has existed between Church and State, has made it so flourishing. From what we have explained, it is clearly deduced, that the Law of 1842 comprises in its programme of studies *morality and religion*, and that it leaves their direction and supervision to the ministers of religion exclusively, and, consequently, that the schools it creates are not godless and undenominational, but denominational (*confessionnelles*). We have reason to be astonished that a Minister of

* To form a comparison between the Normal Schools of the State and those of the clergy, see the speech of M. Van Hoorde in the Chamber of Representatives, the 2nd of last May.

† No school can receive a grant unless it submits to inspection.

the Crown should have presumed to call into question a truth so evident.*

The Law, which gave satisfaction to all parties, and led to such a happy understanding between the State and the Church, was not long in producing abundant fruits. The enemy of all good could not behold without envy a condition so prosperous. As far back as 1846 he sought to disturb it. A Liberal Congress met at Brussels, and the present Prime Minister, M. Frère, persuaded it to adopt a programme for the abrogation of the Law of 1842, and the abolition of the priest's right to enter the schools. The Liberals of those days did not dare openly to show hostility towards the Catholic religion. It was necessary for them to dissemble their designs in order to impose upon the masses. M. Defaiqz, Grandmaster of the Freemasons, opened the Liberal Congress by the declaration that the Congress "desired to render to religion the respect which is due to it." They affected to have to do "only with the encroachments of the clergy, and clerical pretensions." This has been their cry ever since. By this cry they seduce the people at every election. The newspapers, which daily drag priests and religions through the mud, change their language completely when the time for the elections draws near. Then they profess respect for the clergy; they wish only to reform abuses; they "venerate the religion of our fathers." To listen to them, one would think that religion has no stauncher supporters than themselves; they desire to render it more pure by cleansing it of its dross, to make the ministrations of the priests more fruitful, by relieving them of temporal cares. It was by these artifices they succeeded once more deceiving the electors at the last election. In reality, they aim at the apostasy of Belgium. They want compulsory, gratuitous, and atheistic education in order to destroy Christianity; but they dare not say so openly. It is in the dark shades of a Masonic lodge when haranguing the initiated in secret, far from ears profane, that they betray their true sentiments, and exclaim, "A corpse oppresses the world; it bars the road of progress: that corpse of the past, to call it by its proper name without circumlocution, is no other than Catholicism. Yes! Catholicism is a dead body. If we have not

* M. Frère, the Prime Minister, who is a Deist, made another attempt in the sitting of the 27th of May to persuade the Belgian nation that the Law of 1842 constituted education undenominational, and that it was only slightly different from the present Bill. If this be true, we ask, Why change that Law? Why create such a commotion in the country for nothing? The truth is, the leader of the Right, M. Malou, demolished that figment effectually in the sitting of the 28th.

yet buried it, we have, at least, carried it a few steps nearer to the grave.”*

These, honourable Ministers, these are the aspirations of the lodges whose representatives you are in the Government. Permit me to say that others before you have meditated the destruction of Catholicism, and dug its grave; they have passed away long ago; “their corpse no longer bars the road of progress;” and yet Catholicism is living still. Eighteen hundred years ago the chief priests carefully sealed its tomb and set guards over it. It ought never to have come out; yet, a few years afterwards a persecutor, miraculously converted, wrote to the Christians of Rome. “Your faith is spoken of in the whole world.”† During three hundred years the most powerful Emperors in their fury sought to destroy it by persecutions; they flattered themselves that they had buried it in the catacombs, and, behold, it reappears under Constantine more vigorous than ever. There arose an apostate Emperor; he undertook to annihilate Christianity, and to dig the grave of the “Galilæan.” We know what took place, and we have not forgotten the cry of despair which death forced from him—“Galilæan! thou hast conquered.” Since that time many others more powerful than you, down to Luther, to Henry VIII., to Robespierre, have dug the grave of Catholicism. They have disappeared, and the sun of Catholicism

Pursues unchecked its onward course,
Darting its rays with torrent force
On these blasphemers’ heads.

The “Galilæan” has vanquished them all. He vanquished the barbaric hordes, and bent them under the yoke of the Church. He has overthrown all heresies one after another. He has reformed laxity of morals; he has made Europe Christian, and organized the noble civilization whose fruits you enjoy. He called forth those men of genius, those orators, poets, painters, those wonderful artists whose works you admire. The priests whom you expel from the schools of Belgium, the monks whose character you blacken, are the men who cleared our forests, fertilized our fields, drained our marshes, built our cathedrals, with their windows shedding their “dim religious light,” their tall spires, their thousand chef-d’œuvres; who formed masters of thought like Anselm, like Thomas of Aquin, like Bonaventura, those orators who bear the honoured names of Bossuet and Lacordaire. Cite after this the deeds of Freemasons!‡

* Words of M. Van Humbeek, present Minister of Public Instruction, at the Antwerp Lodge, the 26th of December, 1864. † Rom. i. 8.

‡ Yes, that Church which you speak of as a corpse, others besides you, and before you, have attacked her, and predicted her destruction. She has sat upon their tomb. She will see the grave of many more yet. And when

In 1846 the Liberals protested that they wished the school to be religious, and the priest in the school; they insisted only that he should not be admitted except in State shackles. In spite of this mitigation, and notwithstanding that the Liberal party held the reins of Government from 1847 till 1870, not one of the Ministers who succeeded each other, even of those belonging to the Cabinet of M. Frère, ever dared to propose the revision of the Law of 1842.

What no Minister hitherto has dared to attempt, the Lodges of Belgium, having become Atheistic, have insisted shall be done. M. Frère has accepted the task, and the new Minister of Public Instruction,* the avowed representative of the Lodges, has submitted it to the deliberations of Parliament.

This new Bill reproduces a good many of the regulations of the Law of 1842. It also adds a few new Articles, which might prove very useful, with respect to the *gardiennes* schools and the schools of adults; but it abrogates, modifies, or suppresses what was most important in the Law of 1842, what gave that Law all its force, its success, that which was the mainspring of all the progress made in education; it violates the rights of the Communes, disorganizes the Normal Schools, destroys the spirit which animated them for good, and banishes religion, without which there may possibly be instruction, but real education, never. The Bill has been correctly characterized as "a Bill for disorganizing primary education."†

According to the Law of 1842, the school was denominational. The teaching of religion by ministers of religion formed neces-

their corpse shall have become, according to Bossuet's expression, "un je ne sais quoi qui n'a de nom dans aucune langue," the Church shall continue to diffuse, amongst Christian populations, the light and the blessings of her teaching.

* The Ministry of Public Instruction was created last year with a view to the projected Law, and others which are to follow. Up to that time Public Instruction belonged to the Ministry of the Interior.

† "It has been statistically proved that the total cost of primary education since 1843 exceeds 371,000,000 of francs. I draw attention to this figure not because I regret it—on the contrary, I am glad of it; but I ask myself, Shall we not have to regret that expense by-and-by? The new Law, far from increasing the number of pupils, will have the effect of diminishing them from day to day. On its first introduction the staff of teachers will not be changed; there will be no choice between the State school and ignorance. But in proportion as your new trained teachers shall be appointed to schools in our numerous Catholic Communes, desertion will increase as fast as the efforts of our party shall succeed in establishing free schools in opposition to yours. You are about to inaugurate a retrograde movement in public education. It is evident that the nuns who now teach little girls will withdraw from the schools."—Speech of M. Malou, leader of the Right, in the sitting of the 28th of May.

sarily a part of the programme of studies. The purpose of the new Bill is to establish undenominational schools, instruction without dogma, godless education; for, in order to please freethinkers, who do not exist in any considerable number, except in the towns, religion is entirely excluded from the programme. Only by a trick that will deceive no one, lessons in religion are to be tolerated out of school hours in some part of the building.

Here are the principal clauses of the Bill.

Art. 4. The teaching of religion is left to the care of families, and the ministers of the different denominations.* A room in the school is put at the disposal of ministers of religion for the purpose of giving, either before or after school-time, religious instruction to the children of their Communion frequenting the school.

Art. 5. Primary education shall comprise morality, reading, writing, object lessons, the elements of arithmetic, including the legal system of weights and measures, the elements of French, Flemish, or German, according to the requirements of different localities, geography, the history of Belgium, the elements of drawing, including the knowledge of geometrical figures, gymnastics, singing; and for girls, needle work.

To make these regulations still more objectionable the Bill suppresses the supervision of the clergy over the schools; Clerical Inspectors are suppressed; the teachers are to be trained in the State Normal Schools, in which there will be no longer a course of religion—in Normal Schools which will be godless like the Primary Schools. The books selected for teaching are to be examined by the Council of Progress,† and approved by the Government only. The ministers of religion are to have no concern with them, not even with respect to books on religion and morality. Finally, the Communes will be compelled to have one or more schools, and will not be permitted, as they have hitherto been, the liberty of choosing masters and mistresses from whatever Normal School they think proper; but will be forced to choose their staff of teachers from State Schools, in which there will be no longer any spirit of religion, where the spirit of morality will be lost with faith, and where the masters will preach indifference. It is only when there may be a deficiency of teachers in the State Schools that permission will be given to take teachers from the Free Schools. Such are the principal clauses of the new Bill. At the time I am writing

* It was perfectly useless to declare that "the teaching of religion is left to the care of families." Everybody knows that no one requires leave from the Government to teach religion to his children. As it has been well said, "these words are a mask, a blind, a throwing of dust in the eyes." They pretend to have no animosity against religion, whilst they brutally place it outside of the law.

† "Conseil de Perfectionnement."

four weeks have been spent in a general debate on this Bill in the Chamber of Representatives, and it is not yet terminated. The members of the Right oppose the Bill with all their force. The Minister of Public Instruction has replied, seeking to extenuate by denials the hostile provisions of the Bill; but the more advanced of the party, Crombez, Janson, Bergé, Couvreur, have indulged in a reckless cynicism of language against the Bishops and clergy which would not be tolerated with respect to any other class of citizens.

Catholics observe, in the first place, that this Bill does not admit priests into the schools except by placing them in a position that they cannot accept. Religion is degraded; it is placed below gymnastics and sewing. Gymnastics form *necessarily* a part of the programme of studies; but religion which teaches man what he is, whence he comes, whither he goes, is excluded. At most, it is the pleasure of these men to merely permit it to be taught either before or after class. But as the programme of studies embraces so much, there is left scarcely any free time either before or after class. Before class, most frequently, it will be impossible. For in most villages, on account of distance, especially in winter, the children cannot reach school before work has begun. After class the lesson will be without fruit. How can they think that a child, already fatigued by two or three hours of class, can then study with fruit that branch of its education which requires the most attention? Gymnastics may well be given after class; gymnastics consist of only corporeal exercises. But with religion, which initiates the child into the mysteries of God and of man, and virtues the most sublime, the case is very different.

Besides, the position in which the minister of religion is thus placed diminishes his dignity, and takes from the religious course the respect due to it. What! A professor of drawing, a teacher of drill, a sewing mistress, is admitted into the school, and has a right to enforce his or her teaching, and to punish inattentive or unruly children, and the priest is to be left at the door! When the others have all done he is to be allowed, as a favour, to come in—perhaps after the master has depreciated his teaching and preached indifference; those may listen to him who wish, those may go who like. Is not this to degrade, in the eyes of the children, religion and its ministers—that is to say, all that they hold most sacred? Religion is the safeguard of the faith and the morals of childhood; in it is centred the very highest concern of the family, of society, of the State, of the Church—and it is to be put after gymnastics! The religious teaching is to be optional, unsanctioned, excluded from inspection, emulation, or prizes, and in such circumstances the priest *will be permitted*,

if he has the time for it,* to teach Catechism—what mockery! Have they not offered this concession to the clergy only because they hoped it would not be accepted?

The Minister asserts that he cannot include religion among the obligatory subjects of instruction, because the liberty of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution would be violated. According to him the Belgian Constitution establishes “the absolute separation of the State from the Church.” This separation, still according to him, requires *neutral* teaching and *neutral* teachers. There is therefore only the indifferent school, without religion or dogma, the school without God, which can be Constitutional. The Law of 1842, which ranges religion among the subjects to be taught, and confides the explanation of it to a minister of the worship professed by the scholars, violates the Constitution; it must disappear!

The Law of 1842 unconstitutional! Here, assuredly, we have a new pretence; it needed all the lights of the Lodges to discover it, and all their audacity to maintain it. What! This Law was voted unanimously by all the members of the Senate, and by all the members of the Chamber, save three voices. Liberals voted it as well as Catholics. Many of the members who then sat in the Legislative Chambers had taken part in the National Congress. There were among them learned lawyers and eminent magistrates. They all affirmed with pleasure, as we have seen above, the necessity of a religious education, and the necessity, in order to have such education, of concluding an alliance with the Church, with a view to preserving social order and to establishing in Belgium an earnest, efficient education that would correspond with the wishes of parents. It was the price of educational prosperity. Not one of them perceived that the Law of 1842 violated the Constitution. Perhaps it will be pretended that the men who made the Constitution—upright magistrates, informed jurisconsults, men devoted to their country—may not have understood, and did not understand, the Con-

* Often enough the priest will not be able to go to the school. The demands of his ministry, mass, burial service, sick calls, confessions, baptisms, marriages, will detain him elsewhere. Often, too, there will be several schools to one priest. Then, lastly, he will have to teach Catechism to all the classes at once, which is not a possibility. Not being able to deny the justness of these observations, which have been made to him by several members of the Right, the Minister of Public Instruction has softened his language. Now he shows himself if disposed to charge the teacher with the Catechism lesson, in default of the priest, even to indemnify him for it, even to allow him to take the first half-hour of the school time if the children cannot manage to arrive earlier. But meantime he changes nothing, he wishes to change nothing of the Law. It is thus they attempt to mislead opinion.

stitution which they had made ? Since that time, now thirty-seven years ago, Liberals,* equally with Catholics, have found the Law Constitutional. And it is only to-day that they have found themselves to have been all this time mistaken. What do I say ?—even to-day the Liberals are not all of one mind about it. M. Pirmez, a former Liberal Minister, has proved it in the debate. Many among them regret that their party should have thrown itself into the venture. They are fathers ; they think of their children. And if they did not owe a blind obedience to the chiefs who lead them, they would vote for the maintenance of a Law the disappearance of which will be a public calamity, and a source of division in the country, and will draw with it the downfall of primary education in Belgium.

Besides, it is false, absolutely false, that the Law of 1842 is unconstitutional ; it is the new Bill which deserves that name. It is false that the Constitution establishes the absolute separation of Church and State, and requires neutrality of teaching. It would require the impossible. The Constitution is a work of compromise ; a work of good faith between the different parties, as between the different religions, which compose the Belgian nation. It established, not absolute principles, but practical rules ; a *modus vivendi* which was from the first accepted loyally by all, and which the Catholics have, all and always, vigorously and faithfully observed, although some had no sympathy with Constitutional Government. The Constitution did not proclaim the absolute separation of Church and State, but their relative independence. Article 117, which places the salaries of the clergy to the account of the State, proves this unmistakably. Besides, when the State wishes to teach, it ought to give the teaching demanded by parents and by the needs of society, and such teaching necessarily includes religion, which cannot be given by any others than the ministers of religion or under their direction. But here our Bishops must speak :—

No principle of the Constitution sanctions the impious system of excluding religious teaching from public schools.

It is altogether inexact, first of all, that our national Charter places God outside the State and outside the Law, as certain adversaries pretend, in order thence to conclude that the Government ought to have nothing to say to anything which concerns religion.

Consequently, in favouring the civilizing work of the Church, in giving its co-operation to the development of the Church's legitimate influence, the State, far from placing itself in contradiction to the Constitution, conforms to its spirit, and, still more, performs an act of political wisdom.

* M. Frère has been twenty years in power, during which time he has upheld the Law of 1842.

It is not less illogical to found the exclusion of religious teaching from public schools on the neutrality imposed on the State, in view of the various forms of religion. This neutrality is, in fact, altogether derived from the equal liberty which the Constitution promises and guarantees to all religious communions; and hence it is manifest that, far from obliging the State to impede or paralyze that liberty, neutrality imposes on it the mission of protecting it, and rendering it possible and easy for each form of religion. But what will the secularization of schools effect, if not the paralysis and even suppression, as regards children and youth, of the principal exercise of every form of worship—namely, the dogmatic and moral teaching of its adherents, without which neither conviction, practice, nor religious worship is possible? To guarantee to the Catholic religion freedom of exercise, and to close against its ministers the doors of the school, where moral and religious teaching ought to be given to youth, is it not as inconsequent—to illustrate our thought with a comparison—as to decree freedom of industry and commerce, and to close forthwith the sea-port, and the market, to all manufacturers and traders, under pretext of guarding a perfect neutrality towards all? The only conclusion which can be drawn from this Constitutional neutrality is that the Government ought to accord the same protection and the enjoyment of the same rights to all religions. And it is this precisely which the law now in force does.

The proscription of religious instruction in primary schools is again unconstitutional in this, that it overlooks the sacred right of fathers over the education of their children and violates liberty of conscience.

The voice of religion agrees with the voice of Nature in proclaiming that the education of children belongs not to the State,* but to their parents, and that it is for them at once a right and a duty. The schoolmaster only represents the father; he is a delegate charged by him to advance and finish the noble task of educating his children; and to fulfil the task, he ought to instruct and bring them up in such a manner that they may find at school a continuation of home. Therefore the State, in opening, at the expense of the nation, public schools in order to facilitate the education of childhood and youth, is obliged to respect this right inherent in paternity, and so to organize schools as to permit the teacher to fulfil his honourable work conformably to the requirements of his commission.

And can it, *bonâ fide*, be denied that the education of the family rests on religion, and that the first desire of the father who entrusts his child to a school is to see it receive not only solid instruction, but rather an education which renders his child docile, respectful, God-fearing—in a word, a religious education? To open, at the cost of the public treasury, schools from which religious teaching and influence is banished, in order to teach the children only the elements of letters and profane sciences, is therefore to employ the resources of parents in

* M. Laurent has lately written in the *Revue de Belgique* that “the instruction of children belongs to the State.” Other champions of Liberalism have upheld the same doctrine.

payment of an education which their hearts and their consciences equally condemn; is to place the parents in the moral impossibility of fulfilling the grave duty of training their children in a Christian manner; is to violate their liberty of conscience in that precisely which is most dear to them and most sacred.

The truth of this conclusion will appear more manifest still if it is considered that the neutral or secularized school is necessarily irreligious or hostile to the Church. For, even supposing it possible to give children sufficient instruction without touching on religious questions, what effect must be produced on these young minds and hearts by the systematic abstention from all affirmation concerning everything touching on God, their souls, Jesus Christ, the Church, their immortal destiny, except only indifference and contempt? What esteem can they have for a science of which their masters make so little count that they have relegated it among the things which have no bearing on their instruction and education? If our Lord has said of those who do not care to follow Him and walk under His banner: *he who is not with Me is against Me*, is it not clear that we may say also that the education which is not Christian is necessarily anti-Christian? Besides, even by reducing instruction to reading, writing, and arithmetic, the so-called neutral education is impossible. In reality, Christianity which has changed the face of the world and has filled all the centuries, is mixed up with everything, with science as with art, with letters as with history, so that there is no species of knowledge into which the religious element does not enter. Thus, experience has shown that in the schools without God, the teaching of religion has been excluded only the more freely to attack the Catholic Church, and that in place of forming Christians they formed there only freethinkers.*

So that it is not the Law of 1842 which is unconstitutional, but rather the new Bill. This the members of the Right have unanswerably shown during the discussion.

The new Bill is unconstitutional in many respects: firstly, because it imposes neutral teaching and a neutral teacher, which our fundamental pact neither wished nor could wish to do. Our Bishops have established, in the words just quoted, that our national Charter did not exclude God, as some of our adversaries pretend; that it desired not indifferentism, but liberty; that the neutrality observed by it towards the various forms of religion does not demand neutral teaching, and does not exclude religion. Further, education absolutely and completely neutral is impossible even in a primary school.† Doubtless one may teach a child to

* Lettre Pastorale de S. Em. le Cardinal Archevêque et de NN. SS. les Evêques de Belgique, du 7 Déc., 1878.

† On the impossibility of a neutral school see Cardinal Dechamps "Le Nouveau Projet de Loi sur l'Enseignement Primaire." Mechlin, Dessain, 1879. The learned author there demonstrates that the pretended neutrality of a school in connection with religion, history, and morals, is

read, to write, and to sum, without introducing any dogma, though, indeed, ordinarily it is not so, and reading and writing lessons may have for their subject moral and religious truths; but how is a child to be taught its mother tongue, as the programme requires, without explaining to it the words—God, soul, providence, future life, church, mass, sacrament, and so many others which belong to Christian doctrine, and are constantly in the mouths of the people? And how can these words be explained, without declaring for or against Christianity? How shall the teacher explain the great facts of Belgian history—also in the programme—the conversion of the Franks, the effects of Christian civilization, the deeds of Charlemagne, the Crusades, the troubles of the sixteenth century, the upheavings of the French Revolution, without bringing in sentiments either religious, indifferent, or sceptical? The teacher will have religious opinions of his own; he will be a Catholic, as are at present nearly all the teachers, or a freethinker, as they nearly all will be when they come from the new Normal Schools: how can he succeed in never letting the children see what his opinions are? The Catholic children, so observant at their tender and impressionable age, will see that the teacher never makes the sign of a Christian, that he never prays, that there is no crucifix in the school, that the priest is not liked there; and as religion is identified for him with the priest, judge what danger of perversion will hence arise for that young innocent soul, beautiful, but weak and fragile, in which religion must constantly repress inclination.

Catholicism does not admit the "neutral" school. The Bill organizes schools on a footing which will render attendance at them impossible* to the children of Catholic families—who form an immense majority of the nation, and, with a few exceptions, the whole of the rural communes. The Bill overlooks, therefore, without any motive, without signaling any abuse, the most cherished interests, the most sacred rights of an immense majority of Belgian families; and that for the benefit of some few freethinkers who wish to live and die without religion and without God, and who are scarcely to be found except in the large towns. For the greater part of the Liberals, even of those who will vote for the Law, are far from desiring godless schools for their own children; they will continue to send their

only a mask which hides indifferentism, and that such neutrality is both unconstitutional and anti-social. The author says: "I have never seen a neutral master, a neutral book, a neutral history, a neutral philosophy, or neutral morality—such things are chimeras, mere nonsense, lies."

* Such attendance is forbidden: the decisions of the Holy See for the United States and for Ireland indicate in what grave cases and under what conditions Catholic parents can avail themselves of these schools. We do not treat here of this side of the question.

sons and daughters to some Catholic boarding-school, or will keep them at home with private tutors. They are rich and can do so. But, as one of my colleagues* has very well said, they must bear the responsibility of the religious tyranny which would oblige the *nation* to hand over its children to apostasy.

All Belgians should have the power of gaining any public office for which they are qualified. This is a right guaranteed to every one by the Constitution. The Bill is a violation of this right. Henceforth, in order to occupy the post of teacher in the Communal Schools, it will be necessary to have a diploma granted by the official Normal Schools, in which Catholic students will find only a neutral teaching which hurts their consciences. Young people who shall have studied in the clerical Normal Schools, will only be received in exceptional cases. So that, on one side, our Charter proclaims all Belgians equal before the law, and equally eligible to all public employments; on the other, it proclaims liberty of education; while here we have young people brought up in private Normal Schools not able to gain the position of teacher. The State will not be satisfied with fighting against free establishments by a lavish budget; contrary to the Constitution, it will close against them the gate of public employments. Let it reflect: we dare to prophesy. Its Normal Schools will be deserted. The young people will shun these sinks of perdition, in spite of all the attractions of Government favour; parents will dread sending their children to them. In a few years teachers will not be forthcoming, and the State will be obliged to take incapable subjects, or to beg from the clerical schools, which it now rejects so disdainfully. The new Law will exclude our Normal Schools. We shall support them by the aid of Catholic charity. They will supply to the schools which we shall raise against the official schools, in order to save the child's soul, teachers both efficient and Christian.

The Government knows all the odiousness of its project to Catholics; it understands well that the official schools will never enjoy the confidence of Christian families; it will constrain its officials; it will compel the poor to frequent them through the relieving officers (*bureaux de bienfaisance*). But in spite of that the official schools will be deserted. Belgium, which has never allowed its faith to be touched, neither at the time of the Reform, nor under Joseph II., nor under William—Belgium, whose attachment to Catholicity forms, as our adversaries acknowledge, the *national character*, is not ripe for apostasy. The Lodges will not be more powerful than was William or Joseph II. A general movement of condemnation has arisen;

* In the *Revue Catholique* for 1879, p. 225.

it will grow; legal resistance is taking form and shape; and it will assume wider proportions. The Government feels all the gravity of the situation into which it has so madly thrown itself: it dare not appeal to the elections. If it dared, it would be overthrown to-morrow. It tries, therefore, to soften the terms of the Bill; it has placarded in every Commune, and distributed to the electors, circulars reassuring the people, and persuading them that nothing is intended against religion. It proclaims loudly Article 5 of the Bill, which orders *moral* teaching in the schools, and adds, "teachers will speak of God, and of the soul, and of future life," but "without any dogmatic teaching." Who cannot see the trick? Teachers will speak of God, the soul, future life, but without Christian teaching. They will not, then, be able to speak of *our* God, the only true and living; they will not be able to speak of the immortal soul, created to His image, and bought by the blood of Jesus Christ, purified by baptism, and called to participate in supernatural and divine glory; they will not be able to speak of eternal rewards and punishments. For all that is dogmatic teaching. The God of whom they may speak will be a Torso, a mutilated God, deprived wholly or in part of His Divine attributes; it will be a God blasphemously disfigured; far from having created man to His image, he will be fashioned to the notions and the image of man; he will be Nature for the materialists, the great All for the Pantheists, the "devenir" for the Hegelians. The future life will be a life which does not include either heaven or hell, neither rewards nor pains eternal, a life according to the needs and taste of free-thinkers and free-livers. Such is the religious instruction which is promised us by these fallacious words. But the perfidy of the language is unmasked. It cannot long make dupes. The Minister of Public Instruction felt that something more was needed to reassure public opinion. Replying to the incisive and eloquent speech of M. Jacobs, and not knowing how to escape from the solid and close argumentation in which he had entangled him, he went so far as to say that the Government would admit a crucifix into the school.

But if this be so, if your words, M. le Ministre, be sincere, wherefore your Bill to exclude it? Why not with the crucifix admit Christian doctrine which tells what it is, and without which it is nothing—nothing but a bit of wood, fit to be burnt. You cast off Christian doctrine under pretence that it wounds neutrality—in which case, why does not the crucifix, the foundation of all Christian doctrine, also wound it? Christ is a dogma: how can you reconcile Him with the neutrality of your schools? The Common Council of Brussels, composed of your friends, is more consistent. Under pretext of neutrality it has

just cleared all the *gardiennes* schools of the town of their crucifixes. Your friends will do the same everywhere they can, as soon as your Law is passed. *Against* them, indeed, they will have your words of to-day, but *for* them your Law, your words of yesterday and perhaps to-morrow.

Again, it is an attempt to mislead public opinion to say that there will be *moral* teaching in the schools. We ask, What morals? Because it would appear that there are morals and morals. For our part we know only one kind. We know that morality which is called *natural* because God inscribed it on the heart of man, which teaches us our duty to the Deity, to ourselves, to our neighbour. Right reason, illumined by the light of truth, knows it more or less perfectly. For human reason, "always wanting on one side or another" ("*toujours court par quelque'endroit*") mixes with it both its errors and prejudices. The ancient philosophers disfigured it with gross errors. Only Christianity has traced its precepts in clear lines and without mixture of error. Is this the morality they speak of? Then, why not say Christian morality. Protestants, Anglicans, even Jews, do not ask any other. But this is not the morality required. This morality contains some precepts too troublesome for certain of their severe moralists, who, under the cloak of parliamentary immunity, have treated the bishops and clergy so roughly. So they must have another morality; though they are not too clear what. For the members of the Left cannot at all arrange it. M. Le Hardy candidly avows this. Not having been able, as he says, to catch from the words of the speakers who preceded him, what morality is, he, in his turn, essays a definition: "Morality is the *ensemble* of a man's duties to his fellows." A man's duties to God, according to him, belong to religion, and there can be no question of religion in schools where childhood is to be formed to virtue. We pity M. Le Hardy's adepts. Happily, the Minister of Public Instruction is not one of them. For him morality is "the universal conscience which says to all men that they are brothers." It would appear, then, that the conscience of Plato which permitted the murder of infants born deformed, that of Aristotle which distinguished men born slaves and men free, that of the Brahmins which divides humanity into four hostile castes, that of the Anthropopagi who devour their fellows: it would appear, I say, that all these consciences ought to belong to the universal conscience—and yet it must be acknowledged that they signally broke this law of human fraternity.* And so this theory does not in

* Cfr. "La Morale Universelle et Indépendante," by Card. Dechamps. Mechlin, Dessain, 1878.

the least please Citizen Janson, the Brussels Deputy. He has examined all, from Moses, Plato, Christ, Mahomet; up to himself, and he cannot find this universal conscience; but he has discovered that the Decalogue given to Moses on Mount Sinai is "immoral," that the gospel morality is superannuated, and that the true morality is at present only in the process of formation—doubtless, since he took it in hand. Briefly, the moral teaching of the schools will not be Christian; that is no longer desired. It will, therefore, be "independent morality," independent of all dogma, of all beliefs, independent of God, Who is the source and eternal rule of morality; a morality which every man will fashion his own way, and for the rule, authority, and source of which he will look to human nature alone. This morality will change at each one's will and caprice. This is what they offer us to form the infant heart to virtue and to curb the passions of the young!

In closing these lines, written for a Review published in a country where liberty is understood, I cannot help a feeling of sadness as I think of the evils which the enemies of liberty are preparing for my own! A Belgian and a Catholic, profoundly attached to my fatherland, to its free institutions, to its secular traditions, to the Catholic Faith in which I was born, and which I have served in the priesthood and by teaching for these twenty-five years—to that Catholic Faith the secular heritage which Belgium has kept intact through so many vicissitudes, and which since 1830 has covered our land with innumerable works of charity, of the apostolate, of education, I feel a painful emotion possess my soul at the thought of the ruin which the disastrous law of which I have been writing will heap on my country; at the thought of the divisions it will cause, of the souls of so many children—innocent victims—which it will snatch from God and from eternal salvation. My grief breaks forth in spite of me when I see my country, hitherto so happy, abandoned to the adventurous experiments of sophists, to the avidity, the egoism, and the insolence of the Atheistical Lodges;* when I see religion on the point of being chased away as an enemy from those asylums, in part founded by her, where she formed youth to all the Christian and civil virtues under the eye of God; when I think of education, to-day so flourishing, to be so soon disorganized by intolerance under the outraged name of Liberty.

But the Christian never despairs. I have confidence that the wisdom of the Senate will spare Belgium the evils which I foresee.

* M. Cornesse, a Catholic Deputy, demonstrated by a multitude of Masonic documents, in the Session of the 28th May, that the Bill is the work of the Lodges, and that it was drawn up in the Lodge of Antwerp.

But if Providence permits that we should be tried, and that the insane Bill I have explained should become law, there remains for us private education; and we shall make use of it. We shall unite our forces; we shall appeal to the charity of all; in spite of all difficulties we shall build schools wherever we can. Religion shall hold the first place in them; profaner knowledge shall not be neglected there. Whatever there is in modern progress we shall turn to use. But far from our schools be those novelties—the vain display of self-love and vanity—which can only draw childhood away from its path and the people from their position. We shall continue to form children to the Christian virtues, and at the same time to useful knowledge. We shall have our Normal Schools, wherein to train honest and virtuous teachers. With them we shall combat the Official Schools; and I dare to predict that, at the end of a few years, if it persists in maintaining its Law, and in spite of its overflowing budget of twenty-two millions of francs, the State will be frightened at the sight of its empty schools.

T. J. LAMY.

. The hopes expressed in the lines just written have not been realised. On Wednesday, June 18th, the Senate passed the Education Bill by a majority of two. One Senator did not vote. Only one member of the Left—the Prince de Ligne, President of the Senate—had the strength of character to resist the pressure of the Ministry, and to vote according to his convictions. He had the courage to tell his party that the proposed Law was a Law of division, of war, and of misery, which the Liberals of the Congress of 1830, of whom he himself was one, would never have voted for. Such words, uttered by a partisan of the Ministers, are a verdict of condemnation.

It should be observed that this most serious Law, which affects the religious interests of a whole nation, is imposed upon us by a single vote—that of M. Boyaval, Liberal Senator for Bruges. He is ill, and he had himself carried to the Senate to give his vote. At his election for Bruges he had a majority of one, and that vote was his own. It is owing to him that this Bill has become law; if he had not voted the votes would have been equal and the Bill would have been rejected.

In the Chamber of Deputies the Bill was only carried by a majority of seven. Three of these declared that they voted against their personal convictions, and only in order not to separate themselves from their party. One member, for the same reason, abstained from voting. If these four members had had the courage of their convictions, like the Prince de Ligne, the Bill would never have passed the Deputies. It becomes a question

whether, under these circumstances, the Bill will receive the royal assent, without which it cannot become law.

Whatever happens, the Catholics of Belgium have plain warning of the danger that threatens them; and they should lose no time in providing schools for themselves. At Louvain, where these words are written, a beginning has already been made. On June 17th a large site was purchased, and arrangements are being made to have it ready to receive children by the coming October. Contributions and subscriptions are flowing in, and, with what we already have, our schools will run the State schools very close; and the latter will not long enjoy their honours and their victory.

The Belgian Bishops, as soon as the vote of the Senate was made known, addressed to their dioceses a joint Pastoral Letter, in which, after having rehearsed the various reasons that we have pointed out against the new Law, they thus condemn and brand this work of Masonic Liberalism, and at the same time point out to the faithful their duty. We give their grave words:

“Consequently, resting on the authority of the Holy See and docile to its teaching; in union with the Bishops of the whole Catholic world, and notably with the venerable Fathers of the Second National Council of Baltimore (1866 tit. ix., chap. i.), of the First and Fourth Provincial Councils of Westminster (1852 and 1873), of the First, Second, and Third Provincial Councils of Quebec (1851, 1854, and 1863), of the First Provincial Council of Halifax (1857), of the Provincial Council of Sydney (1869), of the Provincial Council of Utrecht (1865), of the Provincial Council of Cologne (1860), of the Assemblies of Irish Bishops held at Maynooth, August 18, 1869, and at Dublin in October, 1871; in fulfilment of our pastoral charge, we denounce the school *régime* which the Civil Power intends to apply to our country, ‘as dangerous and hurtful: We declare that it favours the spread of unbelief and indifferentism, and that it is an attempt against the faith, the piety, and the religious rights of the Belgian people.’ And, for these reasons, ‘We reprobate and condemn it.’

“Again, conforming ourselves to the teaching of the Holy See contained in the already cited Letter of Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Freiburg, and availing ourselves of the Pontiff’s own words: ‘We warn all the faithful, and make known to them that they cannot in conscience attend such schools, founded, as they are, in opposition to the Catholic Church.’

“Observe carefully, dear brethren, that these words of the Pope are derived from a principle, and constitute a rule—a rule applicable to all countries, ‘in all places,’ he says, ‘where the pernicious design is formed, or still more executed, of withdrawing

schools from the authority of the Church, and where, in consequence, youth will be miserably exposed to the danger of losing its faith.' This principle and rule is also recalled by the Congregation of the Holy Office, in its instruction to the Bishops of the United States, approved of by Pius IX. on the 24th November, 1875.

"If the application of this rule in all its rigour is sometimes impossible in countries where the Catholic inhabitants are in a feeble minority, mingled with Dissenters of different sects, wanting the necessary means of establishing schools of their own creed and without Catholic schools accessible to their children, it is not so in Belgium. Modifications elsewhere necessary will be scarcely ever applicable with us.

"Consequently no father and no mother can in conscience place their children in a public school under the *régime* of the new Law, if there be in the place any Catholic school, or if there be a school in the neighbourhood accessible to their children, or if they are able in any other way to provide for their instruction. This prohibition applies to guardians and others to whose charge children are confided.

"We do not think it necessary to explain in detail what Catholic fathers, guardians, or others ought to do in cases different from those defined in the preceding rule; such cases will only be temporary, until, in the very near future, a perfectly organized Catholic school shall be established in every parish. In these exceptional cases each head of a family will consult the priest of his parish, who, after hearing the reasons, will report them to the Bishop in proper form, and the Bishop will decide.

"If it is not permitted in conscience to any head of a family to entrust his children to schools under the new Law, it cannot be permitted to any Catholic, by any spontaneous act, to support such schools, or to assist the execution of such Law. Catholics, therefore, cannot accept school duties; for example, they cannot sit on school committees.

"Pope Pius IX. in his Letter, already cited, to the Archbishop of Freiburg, decides, and the Bishops of the United States, of Holland and Ireland, repeat that 'there is most certainly a very serious obligation on the Church, on laymen, and on the clergy to employ all possible means to provide for Catholic youth Christian education and teaching.'

"The duties of which the Head of the Church reminds us are summed up in two words: 'Let us work and pray.' Let prayer second work, and work prayer. Let us trust to the Divine assistance, for all depends on God; and let us work, employing all human means, as if all depended on ourselves alone.

“The struggle begins from this moment ; it will be long and arduous. You, dear brethren, will accept it with a determination worthy of your character of Catholics and Belgians, whilst repeating the cry of your forefathers, ‘*Dieu le veut.*’ God wills it ! The honour of His Name, the preservation of faith and piety in the souls of your children and in your families, the salvation of our dear and Catholic country—this is at stake. We shall not carry on the battle successfully except by great and constant zealous efforts, by abundant and persevering sacrifices of our means, by the concurrence of the charity of all. Such efforts and sacrifices, Heaven helping us, we shall make, and we have the hope that God will inspire you all with the will to take part generously with us.

“Never was a more urgent duty laid on your piety or your patriotism. We emphasize this consideration, and we borrow and adapt to our position the words which the holy and wise Pontiff who now governs the Church of God, Leo XIII., addressed, a few months ago, to his Cardinal-Vicar, and through him to the clergy and faithful of Rome: ‘The defence of the truth and of religion is incumbent on us all, clergy and laity ; the success of the defence will depend very specially on the abundance of pecuniary aid it can command. As to ourselves, we are resolved to contribute as largely as we can to this work—a Catholic work by excellence ; we shall consecrate to it all our diocesan and private means. But what are these resources to the enormous amount required ? We shall need the assistance, and a large and generous assistance, of our flocks.’

“Already in Belgium, since 1830, a number of families, recognising the obligations of birth, and still more, of faith, have established and supported at their expense schools where children receive instruction appropriate to their social condition, and, at the same time, the knowledge of Catholic doctrine and the practice of the Christian virtues. But these exceptional good works have now to be made general, and their benefit cannot be spread everywhere except by the concurrence of all. Thus we hope, we are certain, that the Catholics of Belgium, animated by the desire of good and the love of God and of souls, and especially those to whom Providence has given a large share of earthly wealth—convinced as they ought to be of the absolute and urgent necessity of providing the young with Christian schools—will count it a duty and an honour to furnish us with the means of establishing them in every parish where they are needed, and of supporting them.

“We need not stimulate the emulation of our clergy in this union of all the faithful for the erection and support of Catholic schools. The Belgian clergy will be outdone by none in gene-

rosity or devotedness. The Catholic priesthood has always figured at the head of every work undertaken for the honour of God and the good of souls: the glorious traditions of the priesthood of Belgium strikingly attest how they have always nobly understood their sublime mission, and they will fulfil it in the present instance. We already know of the admirable acts of charity, in this matter, of numbers of our priests who are comparatively poor.

"If all, clergy and laity, cannot help the work by large gifts, few indeed among them will be unable to contribute to it an alms of a few *centimes* per week, or month, or year, and all can help it on, whether by reminding fathers and mothers of their grave obligation of bringing up their families as Christians, or by teaching prayers and the Catechism to the young, or by themselves undertaking the duties of schoolmaster or mistress. To work, then, very dear brethren, to work! *Dieu le veut!* God wills it!

"Given at Mechlin, the 12th June, 1879.

" + VICTOR AUGUSTE CARDINAL DECHAMPS,
Archbishop of Mechlin.

" + THEODORE, Bishop of Liège.

" + JOHN JOSEPH, Bishop of Bruges.

" + HENRY, Bishop of Ghent.

" + THEODORE JOSEPH, Bishop of Namur.

" + EDMUND, Bishop of Tournay."*

T. J. L.

ART. VIII.—CARDINAL NEWMAN.

Lives of the Cardinals. By PATRICK JUSTIN O'BYRNE.

Part VI. London: Roland, Ladelle & Co. 1879.

THE sixth number, just published, of this interesting and sumptuous publication, contains most appropriately a lengthy biography of Cardinal Newman. As far as we have read the preceding numbers, they are accurate and well written. A few mistakes no doubt occur here and there; as when the writer says of Cardinal Manning that his name was sent up as *dignissimus* by the Chapter of Westminster, after the death of Cardinal Wiseman. What the Chapter does is to select three names, which are sent in without any qualification whatever; and whether Provost Manning was first, second, or third, or whether he was there at all, Mr. O'Byrne, he must pardon us for saying, cannot be sure

* This Pastoral was printed immediately after the vote in the Deputies, and published when the Bill passed the Senate.

that he knows. The historical sketch of the Tractarian movement, and of the effects of the "Gorham" and "Hampden" cases in the "Life of Cardinal Manning," is very strikingly done. The work, with its very fair full-page lithographed portraits, will be very useful and, we hope, popular.

By way of preface to this paper we cannot do better than transcribe the Address which was delivered by Cardinal Newman, with all the marks of careful preparation, at Rome, in the residence of Cardinal Howard, on May 12th last.

His Eminence spoke as follows:—"Vi ringrazio, Monsignore, per la partecipazione che mi avete fatto dell' alto onore che il Santo Padre si è degnato conferire sulla mia persona; and if I ask your permission to continue my address to you, not in your musical language, but in my own dear mother tongue, it is because in the latter I can better express my feelings on this most gracious announcement which you have brought to me, than if I attempted what is above me. First of all, then, I am led to speak of the wonder and profound gratitude which came upon me, and which is upon me still, at the condescension and love towards me of the Holy Father in singling me out for so immense an honour. It was a great surprise. Such an elevation had never come into my thoughts, and seemed to be out of keeping with all my antecedents. I had passed through many trials, but they were over, and now the end of all things had almost come to me and I was at peace. And was it possible that, after all, I had lived through so many years for this? Nor is it easy to see how I could have borne so great a shock had not the Holy Father resolved on a second condescension towards me, which tempered it, and was to all who heard of it a touching evidence of his kindly and generous nature. He felt for me, and he told me the reasons why he raised me to this high position. His act, said he, was a recognition of my zeal and good services for so many years in the Catholic cause. Moreover, he judged it would give pleasure to English Catholics, and even to Protestant England, if I received some mark of his favour. After such gracious words from his Holiness I should have been insensible and heartless if I had had scruples any longer. This is what he had the kindness to say to me, and what could I want more? In a long course of years I have made many mistakes. I have nothing of that high perfection which belongs to the writings of saints—namely, that error cannot be found in them; but what I trust I may claim throughout all that I have written is this—an honest intention, an absence of private ends, a temper of obedience, a willingness to be corrected, a dread of error, a desire to serve the

Holy Church, and through the Divine mercy, a fair measure of success. And, I rejoice to say, to one great mischief I have from the first opposed myself. For thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my powers the spirit of liberalism in religion. Never did the Holy Church need champions against it more sorely than now, when, alas! it is an error overspreading as a snare the whole earth; and on this great occasion, when it is natural for one who is in my place to look out upon the world and upon the Holy Church as it is and upon her future, it will not, I hope, be considered out of place if I renew the protest against it which I have so often made. Liberalism in religion is the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another, and this is the teaching which is gaining substance and force daily. It is inconsistent with the recognition of any religion as true. It teaches that all are to be tolerated, as all are matters of opinion. Revealed religion is not a truth, but a sentiment and a taste—not an objective fact, not miraculous; and it is the right of each individual to make it say just what strikes his fancy. Devotion is not necessarily founded on faith. Men may go to Protestant churches and to Catholic, may get good from both, and belong to neither. They may fraternize together in spiritual thoughts and feelings without having any views at all of doctrine in common or seeing the need of them. Since, then, religion is so personal a peculiarity and so private a possession, we must of necessity ignore it in the intercourse of man with man. If a man puts on a new religion every morning, what is that to you? It is as impertinent to think about a man's religion as about the management of his family. Religion is in no sense the bond of society. Hitherto the civil power has been Christian. Even in countries separated from the Church, as in my own, the *dictum* was in force when I was young that Christianity was the law of the land. Now everywhere that goodly framework of society, which is the creation of Christianity, is throwing off Christianity. The *dictum* to which I have referred, with a hundred others which followed upon it, is gone or is going everywhere, and by the end of the century, unless the Almighty interferes, it will be forgotten. Hitherto it has been considered that religion alone, with its supernatural sanctions, was strong enough to secure the submission of the mass of the population to law and order. Now, philosophers and politicians are bent on satisfying this problem without the aid of Christianity. Instead of the Church's authority and teaching they would substitute, first of all, a universal and a thoroughly secular education, calculated to bring home to every individual that to be orderly, industrious, and sober is his personal interest. Then, for great working principles

to take the place of religion for the use of the masses thus carefully educated, they provide the broad, fundamental, ethical truths of justice, benevolence, veracity, and the like, proved experience, and those natural laws which exist and act spontaneously in society and in social matters, whether physical or psychological—for instance, in government, trade, finance, sanitary experiments, the intercourse of nations. As to religion, it is a private luxury which a man may have if he will, but which, of course, he must pay for, and which he must not obtrude upon others or indulge to their annoyance. The general character of this great apostasy is one and the same everywhere, but in detail and in character it varies in different countries. For myself, I would rather speak of it in my own country, which I know. There, I think, it threatens to have a formidable success, though it is not easy to see what will be its ultimate issue. At first sight it might be thought that Englishmen are too religious for a movement which on the Continent seems to be founded on infidelity; but the misfortune with us is that, though it ends in infidelity, as in other places, it does not necessarily arise out of infidelity. It must be recollected that the religious sects which sprang up in England three centuries ago, and which are so powerful now, have ever been fiercely opposed to the union of Church and State, and would advocate the un-Christianizing the monarchy and all that belongs to it, under the notion that such a catastrophe would make Christianity much more pure and much more powerful. Next, the liberal principle is forced on us through the necessity of the case. Consider what follows from the very fact of these many sects. They constitute the religion, it is supposed, of half the population; and recollect, our mode of government is popular. Every dozen men taken at random whom you meet in the streets have a share in political power. When you inquire into their forms of belief, perhaps they represent one or other of as many as seven religions. How can they possibly act together in municipal or in national matters if each insists on the recognition of his own religious denomination? All action would be at a deadlock unless the subject of religion were ignored. We cannot help ourselves. And, thirdly, it must be borne in mind that there is much in the liberalistic theory which is good and true; for example, not to say more, the precepts of justice, truthfulness, sobriety, self-command, benevolence, which, as I have already noted, are among its avowed principles. It is not till we find that this array of principle is intended to supersede, to block out religion, that we pronounce it to be evil. There never was a device of the enemy so cleverly framed and with such promise of success. And already it has answered to the expectations which have been formed of it. It is sweeping into its

own ranks great numbers of able, earnest, virtuous men—elderly men of approved antecedents, young men with a career before them. Such is the state of things in England, and it is well that it should be realised by all of us; but it must not be supposed for a moment that I am afraid of it. I lament it deeply, because I foresee that it may be the ruin of many souls; but I have no fear at all that it really can do aught of serious harm to the work of truth, to the Holy Church, to our Almighty King, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, faithful and true, or to His Vicar on earth. Christianity has been too often in what seemed deadly peril that we should fear for it any new trial now. So far is certain. On the other hand, what is uncertain, and in these great contests commonly is uncertain, and what is commonly a great surprise when it is witnessed, is the particular mode in the event by which Providence rescues and saves his elect inheritance. Sometimes our enemy is turned into a friend; sometimes he is despoiled of that special virulence of evil which was so threatening; sometimes he falls to pieces of himself; sometimes he does just so much as is beneficial and then is removed. Commonly the Church has nothing more to do than to go on in her own proper duties in confidence and peace, to stand still, and to see the salvation of God. *Mansueti hereditabunt terram et delectabuntur in multitudine pacis.*”

There are so many circumstances which combine to make the elevation of Cardinal Newman a truly remarkable event, that whatsoever is said here will be necessarily incomplete. That there should be three English Cardinals at one time is unusual, to begin with. That one of them, not being a bishop in administration of a See, should nevertheless live in England; that he should be a Father of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, and that he should be a convert from Anglicanism; all these aspects of the matter are full of suggestiveness. But the absolutely unparalleled position which has for a long time been held by John Henry Newman in relation to the spiritual and ecclesiastical questions which occupy contemporary thought in England, is such as to make his creation as a Cardinal equivalent to a Papal pronouncement on “30, 40, 50 years” of the religious history of the nineteenth century.

“We have resolved,” said the Pope, to the Consistory of May 12th, “to add to your College certain illustrious and esteemed men, who have made themselves perfectly worthy to bear your sublime title, and to wear the insignia of your order; some by their abounding zeal, their prudence, and their skill in pastoral administration, in the care of souls, and in the defence of the doctrines and rights of the Church by published writings and by

the ministry of the Word ; others by their eminent learning and the renown they have acquired in teaching, or by the publication of noble monuments of their genius ; and all by their unshaken faith towards this Apostolic See, by great labours undergone in the cause of the Church, and by the merit of their priestly virtue and constancy, proved in very many ways." *

Cardinal Newman, then, receives his dignity for a series of splendid writings, characterized, as has also been his personal life, by unshaken faith and fidelity to the See of Rome ; by hard work in the cause of the Holy Church ; and by that constancy in virtue without which genius is vain and power a snare. No words could express more pointedly than those of Leo XIII., the broad view which the world, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, will take of the promotion of Cardinal Newman. No sentences could better lift the Catholic mind above ingenious explanations and small secrets. None could more effectually rebuke the persistent attempts, on the part of some non-Catholics, to prove their dreaded scourge to be a "Liberal," a discontented, a disappointed man, a half-Catholic on the verge of turning back to what he had renounced. And no words, perhaps, could better convey to the venerable confessor of the faith, worn-out now by the anxiety and physical strain of a hundred critical fights, the consoling assurance that that Judge in whom calm investigation, simplicity of motive, the light of prayer and the not far-off assistance of the Holy Spirit, combine to make an intellectual daylight which shines for him alone, has received and approved of the labours of his life.

It is difficult to speak of a great man who is yet living ; and that consideration will necessarily make all attempts at an appreciation of the latest English Cardinal much more colourless and measured than they ought to be. But there are men whose names belong to history before themselves have disappeared from the stage of actual work ; and whilst it is the prayer of all of us that the illustrious Oratorian may live many years longer, yet it is impossible to allow an opportunity to go by such as now offers itself, of commenting on a career which will hereafter be cited as an integral part of the history of English Catholicism.

Cardinal Newman's wonderful life offers two aspects for consideration. The first is, his exceptional power and influence over Englishmen of every religious school, but especially over those who in any way own allegiance to the Anglican Church ; and the second is, the special service which, partly on account of that

* Omnes demum immotâ fide erga hanc Apostolicam Sedem, exantlatis pro Ecclesia laboribus, et egregiis meritis sacerdotalis virtutis et constantiæ, multis argumentis spectatæ et cognitæ.

influence, and partly by the same gifts to which that influence was owing, he has rendered to the Holy Catholic Faith.

There can be no question that, whatever be the merits of the conflicts and controversies associated with the name of Newman, the root and substance of his influence over his countrymen is his singular gift of speech. It is not easy to analyze an endowment which is in him the embodiment of nothing less than genius. His power of language consists in perfection of form and poetic or imaginative glow. It is a gift which did not spring up mature in a single hour. We can watch it gradually growing and ripening, from the first "Essay on Miracles" to the gem-like finish and white light of his later sermons, and of some portions of the "Apologia." His writings, when they come to be submitted to the tests and analysis of criticism, will be found to present a harmoniously changing series of forms and colours. They offer, in their earliest specimens, great sobriety and even a suspicion of poverty. They are refined in form and simple in expression; but the writer is under the influence of the eighteenth century moralists, and he is cold and a little dry. He reminds us of Locke without Locke's vigour, and his sententiousness is that of Blair and the sermon-writers, or Reid and the common-sense philosophers. But as he grows older, and his thought deepens and his experiences enlarge, the comparatively thin and pale style takes substance and colour. In the sermons of the period of his Oxford days every point of Christian life and ecclesiastical practice is touched, and the heart of a lover of men, warmed by the fancy of a poet, weaves the sober threads of common morality into a web of deep and effective colour. The colour, it may be, is a little too luxuriant, and the imagination less chastened than a preacher's fancy should be. But the Newman of the "Plain and Parochial Sermons," though a poet, does not write what is commonly called poetical prose. On the contrary, he most unmistakably preaches. And whatever was excellent and worthy in his style grew more excellent as he wrote more, while the defects seemed to wane and disappear. His style seems to be no "style." There is nothing to seize upon in its character; no brilliant excess, or splendid fault, or grand eccentricity. Like all first-class writers, Demosthenes, for instance, or Bossuet, or George Eliot, he wears his style like a robe measured to his height and movement as by the ministry of some deity. The form grows yearly more absolute and more pure in outline, because the mental analysis is growing every year more rapid and finished. The colour, which at first both brightens and tinges the thoughts, gradually turns into a whiter light, which pours radiance without interposing any gross foreign atmosphere between the eye and the thought. Thus to read Newman is easy, and it is exhila-

rating. It is easy, as nature is easy, and as the eye easily follows the outlines and the colours of hill and plain, trees and water, on a bright morning in summer. It is exhilarating, because there is always exhilaration in the series of slight mental shocks caused by fertile analysis, unexpected comparison, happily-found relation, exactly-hitting epithet, and phrases whose momentum is undiminished by inartistic padding. Such power of attracting he displays, too, on the very largest scale. Genius is in nothing shown so distinctly as in the power of a mind to leap across great chasms, and join together in some novel synthesis ideas which ordinary minds have never compared. This is a power which cannot be acquired. Yet without assiduous study and thought, it is a power which will lie idle for want of solid earth to stand on. It is this combination of far-seeing insight and wide reading which make the historical "views" of Cardinal Newman so new, so interesting, and so inspiring. From the point of view of art, it may, perhaps, be said that he has nowhere succeeded as he has in history. Strange to say, there is no branch of "speech" which calls for originality of view so loudly as history. There are historians who are original at the expense of truth and fact. But the real historic temper is that of him who directs the mental view of the reader to points and combinations and symmetrical arrangements in the completed and monumental facts which he would not have discovered for himself. Such is Newman in history. But he is almost equally great in his analysis of questions half literary and half metaphysical, such as he treats in the "University" series, and in that mingling of wide view, sententious thought, and tender grace with which all the world is familiar in the "Sermons." It is a tempting theme to discuss, the "art of speech" of John Henry Newman. It is certain that it counts for the chief among the forces which make him what he has been and is.

As it always happens, Cardinal Newman partly shaped, partly was shaped, by his circumstances. It was the "Oxford movement" which gave him his power, and placed in his hands the sceptre he still wields; and it need not be said that the Oxford movement was in a great measure the movement and the march of his own mind. Whatever was done by others—true as it may be that Keble contributed the poetry, and Pusey the learning, to the Tractarian revival—Newman was the only one who gave it a voice.

The crowd does not put things together for themselves; and the world might have long endured Dr. Pusey's interminable patristic, and enjoyed Mr. Keble's fanciful Anglicanism, without recognising that they were part of the *Via Media*. But when a voice, clear, definite, and sonorous, was heard in sermon, tract,

letter, and pamphlet, announcing new discoveries, claiming attention to forgotten truths, and directing the minds of readers where to look, and what to look for, then the "movement" began to be personified, and even the careless seeker after news had a mental full-length figure of it ready for practical use. And Newman was fortunate in his audience. Cardinal Newman's audience, now, is the English-speaking public of the world. But it must not be forgotten that there was a long time during which he was read and admired by no more than a party. Indeed, it seems true to say that his general popularity dates only from the day of the "Apologia." But still he was very happy in his first audience. It was his fortune, whilst it was also a duty he clearly recognised, to stand up for antiquity, learning, and ideal holiness, against innovation and neglect; to battle for a "venerable Church," as a son for his mother, or a knight errant for a maiden in distress; to uphold, as a gentleman, a clergyman, and a Tory, that "divine right" of the educated, refined, and easy classes, the denial of which opens the way to revolution and impiety. At Oxford he was listened to by the very best men of England; and by birth and association they naturally listened to him with persuasion and delight. The Liberal party, then just pushing out its horns, was nowhere before him—until he took one step too far. He might have gone to any length in his theories of Church and Sacraments had he but stopped short of Rome. Of course, he could do nothing of the kind; the leaven in his mind had to spread; the tiny seed had to grow to a tree. But the moment it seemed certain that his spoken words (whatever his private views) pointed to friendship with Rome and to reconciliation, then the friends who had cheered him on grew silent (save a few), the authorities of his University condemned him, and the bishops whose office he had so greatly magnified cast every one a stone that was intended to crush him. But he had secured his audience. The men who had been under his spell could never forget him. They who were young in Oxford, in the decade of 1833-43, have either passed away or else they are living in mature age, but they have done more to mould the political, literary, and social life of England during the forty years since elapsed, than any of their contemporaries. And they are the foundation of the reputation of John Henry Newman—the peers, statesmen, country gentlemen, academic teachers, and numberless clergymen who lived in, or joined in, the historic struggle which has changed so much, and—so far—settled so little. Men who were to guide the national voice looked back to early hints and inspirations received some Sunday in S. Mary's; men who were to influence crowds of men, and two or three generations of men, in parishes large and small, had to thank him for more than one

powerful and fertile principle; men who carried on controversy had to devote a chapter or a paragraph to Tract 90; men who in great measure made the best books, the truest histories, the sweetest songs, the most admired and influential novels, the loftiest leading articles, had his name by heart, and also some page of his wide writings, where they had found something which they would not forget. Thus, with an exceptional audience, and with the noblest and deepest of human controversies to argue in, Dr. Newman put the mighty weapon of his speech to the proof, and whilst he himself looked only to the victory of truth, he drew after him by the magic of his word the best minds and hearts of his generation.

And yet, as we have hinted, Dr. Newman was not always "popular" in England. He was not popular in 1841; and he was not popular in 1845; and during the first twenty years of his life as a Catholic he was admired, certainly, by a wide circle, and respected by public writers of every school, but there was a widespread feeling that he was more eloquent, more ingenious, more clever than he was straightforward. In 1865 he wrote as follows:—

It is now more than twenty years that a vague impression to my disadvantage has rested on the popular mind, as if my conduct towards the Anglican Church, when I was a member of it, was inconsistent with Christian simplicity and uprightness. . . . For twenty years and more I have borne an imputation of which I am at least as sensitive, who am the object of it, as they can be, who are only the judges.*

We all know how the reckless imputation of a popular writer of the day gave him an opportunity of dealing with this imputation, and how he used it. The "*Apologia*," a book of "confessions" written with the utmost rapidity, from an overflowing consciousness, and yet as admirable in form and structure as if it had been elaborated during long years, broke down the barriers that kept the crowd of Englishmen at a distance from Dr. Newman. The appeal for fair play, the recital of a story which needed no comment, the genuine accent of truth, were too much for the English people, and they took him to their heart. And now, fourteen years since the "*Apologia*" appeared, there has been given to them a chance of showing what they think of him. It is an occasion not without its complexity. That Newman should be honoured, chimes in with the popular wish. But that Newman should be distrusted and unnoticed by his Church, has also been among the articles of the public faith and hope. Yet the honour and the recognition come in the shape of that exciting

* "*Apologia*," iv. xiii.

red hat of the Roman Cardinalate, which has more than once roused the English mind to a short madness. It went against the grain to be glad that even Newman had been decorated by the Court of Rome. Something was said, no doubt, about new Popes and more liberal measures; but even the British public has been unable to prove to its satisfaction that Leo XIII. is substantially different from Pius IX.; and therefore the honour conferred on the great English leader of thought was inextricably bound up with the fact that he was recognised, by the one authority which knows best, as a most thorough and absolute Catholic. There was no help for it, and the English people must either proclaim John Henry Newman to be at one with the Pope, or hold its tongue and make no sign. The situation, as we know, has been accepted. English opinion has spoken, in every form and manner of which it is capable, if we except what occurs at times of political crisis, and has proclaimed its love for the man, and its trust in his honour and his intentions, and its delight that he has been made a Cardinal.

If the Church of God were a human institution, it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the presence in her ranks of such a name and such a force as this. As it is, she depends not on man; and He on whom she does depend makes use, as often as not, of the least, the weakest and the most contemptible means, to extend her empire and strengthen her influence. Still there are from time to time men like S. Paul and S. Augustine—men who have human genius and wordly renown—whose work is certainly not less successful because they are equipped with earthly as well as heavenly weapons.

Taking a human view of the exaltation of the Catholic Church in England and of England's conversion, the most imperative and pressing work to be done has been, and is yet, the removal of public prejudice. It is always deeply mysterious and awe-inspiring to observe how God's might is allowed by Himself to be baffled by a petty obstacle. The abounding grace of the Sacraments depends on the presence of a minister. Our Lord in the Tabernacle will not move to the bed of His dying servant unless there is one to carry Him. Thousands and millions of Pagans continue to die outside of the range—not of the Precious Blood—but of its ordinary means of application, because there is no human voice to reach their simple hearts, and no human hand to lift up the crucifix to their childlike gaze. Many vocations are frustrated, and many souls remain to the end in low and dim regions of the spiritual life for want of a voice or a book. Hundreds of our own countrymen and countrywomen, with every natural preparation for grace, with pure natures, educated intelligence and cultured habits, nay, even with the graces of baptism

or the graces of contrition, remain outside the Church and hostile to the Church; and one cannot help knowing that if they had been born in the Church, or had had a somewhat different bringing up, or had lived in other surroundings, they would have been much more fervent Catholics than we ourselves. And this is true even of masses of the English people, among whom, in many regions of England and Wales, there is a natural earnestness, an inborn reverence for the unseen, and even an emotional worship of God and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, which make one cry out with tears, on noticing their hard repulsion to Catholicism, What noble Catholics these people would make did they but know things as they really are! Yet the grace and the power of God, able to save them and a thousand Englands over and over again, are held back, apparently, by the mean physical circumstance that their souls have had no teacher and no preacher. The beneficent flood that would gladden the desolate land, and make the wilderness rejoice and flourish like the lily, is pent up and restrained by banks and mounds of earthly clay, which a strong man would pierce through in an hour. It must be always so; for the Incarnation has set the law of God's working, and the Saviour of the world must always depend upon His mother and His foster-father, upon His brethren and His apostles, and even upon the movements of His scorers and His enemies. As far as one can see, the greatest service which can be done for the conversion of England is, to lift from her that cloud of prejudice which keeps her from knowing what Catholicism is. Leaving individuals out of the question, if the country is to be converted a generation must first grow which sees a number of things very differently from what they have been, and are, seen. England must be accustomed to the *look* of Catholicism, so as to meet it without shrinking, to catch sight of it without screaming out, to walk round it without spitting upon it. It is not the worship of God, or the love of Jesus Christ, or salvation through His Blood, or the existence of a dignified hierarchy of teachers, or the decent conduct of external worship, that Protestant England objects to; but she is frightened at the things which her tradition has made into scarecrows—Mass, Confession, the Blessed Virgin, the Pope. There is nothing, except the multiplication of prayer, which is so well calculated to give good hope of the future, as the change which has been going on in regard to such matters as these during the last five and twenty years. England is not converted; far from it; it is possible we lose more of our poor people than we gain from heresy. But a wave of preparation is passing over the country. Books, periodicals, and newspapers are not so outrageous as they once were. Public meetings are not as those during the Papal Aggression days. The

numbers of Protestants who attend our Churches in the large towns, and the number of children who are either in contact with our priests, or at least not systematically inoculated with falsehood and hatred, is increasing every year. Dogmatic Protestantism is becoming discredited even too fast, for whilst we have not yet reached the main body of the English people, their religious ideas are breaking up, and they are passing over to unbelief.

Although many venerable names could be mentioned as having taken part in that removal or reversal of the "Protestant tradition," now happily proceeding, no one will doubt for a moment that the one who has done the giant's share of the work is Cardinal Newman. His lectures on Anglican Difficulties, for instance, were delivered a quarter of a century ago. They form, together with those on the "Present Position of Catholics," an era in Catholic controversy. Their exhortations, their explanations, their expostulations, their happy sarcasm, both pleased the public and enlightened it.

But in truth his services to Catholicism in England began long before his conversion. The work of his Oxford days was the elaboration of the portrait of a dogmatic Church. That work, promoted and extended as it has been by his followers inside and outside Catholicism, has ended in placing before the eyes of every Englishman who reads, the majestic figure of the true Church of Christ. It has been a long and a complex labour. S. Augustine, 1200 years ago, simply marched up to the assembly of the men of Kent, singing a Litany and holding aloft the figure of our Redeemer. "The awful form of Catholicism," to use Cardinal Newman's own words, "finds in the Englishman a very different being from the simple Anglo-Saxon to whom it originally came." And to open his eyes it has taken much work during nearly half a century, and will take much more—sermons, lectures, dogmatic treatises, and even popular tales; but everywhere we meet the name of Newman. If one merely looks at a list of subjects, such as is to be found in Mr. Lilly's well-known volume,* some idea may be formed of the enormous number of points connected with the Catholic Church in which Dr. Newman, during thirty or forty years, has enlightened and rectified the ideas of his countrymen. We find, for instance,—*"Faith in the Catholic Church," "Dispositions for Joining the Catholic Church," "A Convert," "Faith and Devotion," "Private Judgment among Catholics," "The Aim of the Catholic Church," "The Religion of Catholics," "The Privileges of Catholics," "Transubstantiation," "Mass," "Benediction," "Confession," "Relics and Miracles,"*

* *"Characteristics from the Writings of Cardinal Newman."* (Kegan Paul.)

"The Blessed Virgin" (many times over), "The Obligations of Catholics to the Holy See," "Scandals in the Catholic Church," "A Bad Catholic," "The Idea of a Saint;" and, in addition, there are the numerous passages in which he compares the Church with Anglicanism or Protestantism.

He has not only taken a chief part in creating, in English literature, a true portrait of the Church, but he has forced his countrymen to believe that a man may be a Catholic, and yet a reasonable and free being, and a loyal Englishman.

Cardinal Newman holds a very marked and clearly defined position in regard to religious belief. His most distinctly dominant attitude of mind has always been the keen perception of the absolute duty of submitting the intellect to the divinely-protected Church of Christ. In this respect he underwent no intellectual change when he left Anglicanism and became a Catholic.* It was for this truth he contended in his Oxford days—even when he did not recognise the living Church herself. He has always, since his reception, told inquirers that they must "receive (revealed dogma) as it is infallibly interpreted by the authority to whom it is thus committed (the Church), and (implicitly) as it shall be, in like manner, further interpreted by that same authority to the end of time."† To him the Church is the "region of light, the home of peace, the presence of the Saints."‡ "I have been in perfect peace and contentment; I have never had one doubt" (since his reception). He had no trouble "about receiving those additional articles which are not found in the Anglican Creed." "Some of them I believed already, but not any one of them was a trial to me. I made a profession of them at my reception with the greatest ease, and I have the same ease in believing them now."§ We may say, indeed, that the prominent aim and combat of his life has been to present and explain and defend the infallible teaching office of the Church. The principle of submission to authority in matters of religion led him (humanly speaking) to Catholicism, and, so far as a Catholic can be of one spirit rather than another, the same principle informs and moves him still. This ruling *leit-motiv* in Cardinal Newman's life explains his attitude in matters antecedent to faith, and also in matters where the principle of authority, though still present, gradually vanishes, first to a penumbra and then into vacancy. He has rather scorned the Agnostic controversy. It has seemed to him that the belief in a God has no antagonists. Not that all men, or all

* "Apologia," p. 238.

† Ibid., p. 351.

‡ "Discourses to Mixed Congregations," p. 189.

§ "Apologia," p. 238.

Englishmen, believe in God ; but that no one of them has ever given such a definite account of his views, his reasons, his substitutes for God, his proposals to supply the space left vacant by the withdrawal of religion, as can be seized or grappled with. It has been the same with him in regard to revelation in general. He has considered it undignified for a Catholic "to commit himself to the work of chasing what might turn out to be phantoms, and, in behalf of some special objections to be ingenious in devising a theory, which, before it was completed, might have to give place to some theory newer still, from the fact that these former objections had already come to nought under the uprising of others." His view has been, and is, that Christians are just now called on to be patient ; they may sit still, and God will work ; they are to go on, priests preaching and explaining, people acting out Catholicism in their lives ; and difficulties will drop down or eat each other up ; *mansueti hereditabunt terram*, as he said the other day in Rome. Hence he has given an account of his own belief in God, and in an infallible Church ; but he has not argued or controverted with the Agnostics, or the physical science people.

This is, obviously, not the time to speak of what Cardinal Newman has done for his fellow Catholics in regard to matters which concern rather themselves than their non-Catholic countrymen. He is not dead yet. May that day be very far away ! But let us notice one or two facts that lie on the surface. First of all, he has shown us how to Catholicize our national tongue. Catholicism is "universal" in time and in locality ; and when she puts on the temporary dress of a vernacular tongue, either she forces it into her own moulds, or else, if the native tongue is too strong, she must adapt her forms to its genius ; and as her first concern is with her own dogma and practice, such adaptation is sometimes roughly done and repellent. The English language is a strong and deeply-rooted tree of human speech. When it was growing, three hundred years ago, into what it is now, happily old Catholic memories were still alive to mould it and to impregnate it with their odour. Yet during that three hundred years the English tongue has grown very unfamiliar with Catholic exposition and Catholic prayer. When the English Catholic wrote, he wrote in France or in Belgium ; when he preached to English ears his sermon was often too nearly akin to French idiom, or too stiff with Latinized phrases to claim citizenship on English soil. The deficiency was not keenly felt until within living memory. Up to the day of the railway and the cheap newspaper, we perhaps held our own. The two Butlers, Bishop Challoner, Bishop Milner, and, most remarkable of all, Dr Lingard, wrote as good English as all but the foremost of their

respective contemporaries. But rapid communication and cheap printing has given, by an easily understood process, a stimulus to literary style such as it never had since the invention of printing. A leading article in the *Times* or the *Spectator* is now as mechanically perfect as a page of Gibbon. The trick and turn of a great writer is spread over the whole field of literature in a year or two; and a single powerful genius will within that period distinctly raise the general level of literary excellence. Two of our foremost writers and speakers among born Catholics during the last forty (not to mention any still living) years have been Bishop Baines and Cardinal Wiseman. Bishop Baines was a man of deep, earnest thought and eloquent expression; Cardinal Wiseman was one of those masculine and powerful minds, whose achievements satisfy the reader because the writer has first honestly satisfied himself; but neither of them could have conceived the "Second Spring," or "Loss and Gain," or the letter to Dr. Pusey. Not that Cardinal Wiseman has not left us undying pages of touching exhortation, of powerful apologetic, of fancy, and of patristic exposition. But the difference is still most striking; it is not a difference in degree, but in kind; it is the difference between Giotto and Raffaele; between Handel and Beethoven. There are many amongst us at this moment—chiefly, no doubt, the Oxford converts—who treat Catholic dogma and exhortation in a pure style of modern English. But it will not be denied that Cardinal Newman has taken the lead here again. He has given us dogmatic theology in English (as in the theological pages of the "Grammar of Assent"), moral theology in English, devotion in English, most genuinely English sermons, Church History in a fashion which would make one say that English is the native tongue of Socrates and Eusebius, of Chrysostom and Basil, and most frankly English polemical exercises, which sparkle as pleasantly to the eye, and go as keenly to the mark, as any literary criticism of the day. The more one reads him the more one feels that there are few regions of Catholic thought, from the most technical divinity down to a simple prayer of pious ejaculation, which his great gift of speech has not taken possession of. The advantage which he, and those like him, have thus put into our hands is like the gift of new steel rails of the latest make; or of the most modern fluid-compressed steel projectiles; the substance of English Catholic speech is indefinitely more true, more steady, more lasting, and more effective.

It is a subject of regret that Cardinal Newman has yet given us comparatively so little of what we may call elaborate uncontroversial exposition of Catholic doctrine. The presentment of God's holy truth, calmly, strongly, and beautifully laid

before the heart, without the hurry of periodical writing, or the heat of controversy, is one of the most powerful means of strengthening faith. Cardinal Newman has given us grand pages and chapters of such exposition; but we long for treatises. It has been through no fault of his that he has not done more. He has generally written for the occasion. He has had over and over again to leave off building the walls of Sion, in order to sally out against some Sanaballat and his marauders. Therefore, for what we have we are grateful.

Speaking for the born-Catholics of a generation now no longer young, we can say with affectionate sincerity, that they have grown up and thriven on the writings of John Henry Newman; their early years were brightened by his genius, their hearts were stirred in youth by his pictures of the majesty and holiness of God's Kingdom, their mature studies have been illumined by his far-reaching thought, and they have looked up to him—and do now more than ever look up to him—as a leader and a father. They have not always quite agreed with a phrase or a paragraph; they have been aware, as by some subtle instinct, that the great Oratorian has feelings as quick as his intellect is deep; they have felt that occasionally nerves and antipathies have become articulate, and judgment been overlooked. Yet these very signs are valuable, as proving that his whole life and mind are in his writings; and that what he says he does not say through any policy or purely external pressure, but because he truly *is* to the very bottom what he utters. He has lived and waited as a Catholic now for over thirty years. He did not know that he was waiting for anything except the coming of his Redeemer, and perhaps the tardy reparation by his countrymen of some of their misjudgments. In the true spirit of S. Philip, he sat at home. Men sought him out; every Oratorian expects to be sought. The home of the spirit which he made for those who sought him has been a home in more senses than even S. Philip's houses usually are. How many have found his Oratory the porch and threshold of God's earthly and heavenly Kingdom! In his quiet home the word of Leo XIII. found him, and called him, as another Pope found and called Baronius. Those who have known him near at hand, and those whose eyes have followed him from afar—his friends, his children, and his disciples—the Church at home and abroad, and Englishmen everywhere—are glad that honour has sought out one whom in so many ways they have learnt to prize for his genius and to love for himself.

Science Notices.

The Telephone.—Among the recent discoveries in science the loud-speaking Telephone of Mr. Edison deserves something more than a passing notice. If the invention at all realises its early promise, we may confidently predict that we are upon the eve of a revolution in telegraphy.

The principle on which the instrument is founded is quite a new one, and, in fact, so far inexplicable to science. It was, it seems owing to the accident of holding his finger against the stylus of a Morse instrument that Mr. Edison was led to notice it. An easy experiment will explain better than anything else the principle in question. A metallic plate is connected with a battery, and a flat stylus, similarly connected, is arranged to press gently on the plate. A piece of blotting-paper, damped with a solution of caustic potash, is now laid upon the plate beneath the stylus. It will be obvious that if the plate be drawn beneath the stylus a certain amount of resistance will be encountered, owing to the friction set up between the paper and the stylus. But directly the battery is connected, it will be found that all frictional resistance will vanish, and the stylus move over the blotting-paper as if the latter were the smoothest of known substances.

No one as yet has succeeded in giving a satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. It is surmised that it must have its origin in molecular changes, as yet rather obscure, to which, however, Mr. Crookes is now drawing attention, and which seem to promise us startling revelations into the world of matter. Mr. Edison has, in the meantime, taken advantage of the fact to construct his telephone on this principle; and all who have heard it agree in representing its performance as not only highly successful, but little short of marvellous.

The instrument consists of a box about eight inches square. A diaphragm, preferably of mica, some four inches in diameter, is let into one of the sides. To the centre of this piece of mica a strip of metal is attached by one of its ends; the farther or free end plays on a little cylinder of chalk, which is capable of being set in rotation by the hand. The chalk, which is impregnated with a solution of sulphate of soda, is kept moist by mechanical arrangements. The action is not difficult to follow. The chalk cylinder is set in rotation by the hand and establishes a certain amount of friction between itself and the strip of metal; the effect of this, of course, will be to pull in the centre of the mica diaphragm, which then assumes a concave shape on the side turned to the spectator. So far the movements are purely mechanical and simple. The electric action, however, sets in as soon as the voice at the transmitting end throws the plate of mica at that end into vibration. These vibrations cause a current of electricity to pass along

the wire and into the chalk cylinder; in an instant the friction is destroyed, and the concave mica plate springs back released from the friction on the cylinder. And as a series of vibrations are given to the mica at the transmitting end, a series of rapidly changing electric waves are passed on to the mica at the speaking end which thus faithfully represents every motion impressed upon the transmitting plate. Thus, if we were to sound the note middle C at the transmitting end we should imprint 264 vibrations on the mica plate, consequently there would be 264 electric currents started, and 264 slips of the metal which would produce the note C at the distant station. It has been suggested as a probable explanation of the reproduction of the sound that the rotating cylinder acts on the spring attached to the mica like a resined bow on a violin string; vibrations are set up whose extent, manner, and rate are modified by the varying friction due to the current.

It is fair to state, in justice to Mr. Edison, that we have as yet seen but an imperfect performance of his instrument. The telephone now on exhibition was hastily put together at the urgent request of Col. Gouraud—Mr. Edison's London representative; new and more complete receivers will be sent over shortly, previous to their general introduction into this country.

The Electric Light.—The sudden subsidence of the excitement on the subject of the electric light has long been foreseen, but it was hardly expected to occur so soon. There can be no doubt that the original impetus was given to the movement by the introduction of the Jablochkoff "electric candle" in the Avenue de l'Opéra, in Paris. Closely following upon this came the startling announcement from America that Mr. Edison had succeeded in dividing the electric light. A panic set in among the holders of gas shares, and in America, at least, the shares touched so low a point that the alarmists must have suffered considerably.

It is not the first time that the public mind has been aroused by startling announcements in connection with electric lighting. As far back as 1845, Mr. King, of London, took out a patent for electric lighting by means of the incandescence of platinum. Other inventors for platinum have substituted iridium, a metal which has a very high fusing point; and the latest advices from America state that Mr. Edison, in his reported discovery, has had recourse to iridium as a source of light.

There are formidable difficulties in the use of any metal in the poles of the electric arc. The incandescence is produced by the specific resistance of the metal which the current encounters in its path. Now the points of metallic incandescence and fusion are, so to speak, such close neighbours, that one can hardly be excited without affecting the other; *Tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet*. It will, therefore, require a very delicate adjustment of the current to produce just enough heat to make the metal glow, but not melt. In fact, the difficulties in the way of effecting this result have been so

serious as to lead to the general substitution of carbon conductors, which are not readily fused or volatilized. For many years nothing more was heard upon the subject. In 1876 fresh interest in the question revived, when M. Jablochhoff, an officer in the Russian army, brought forward his arrangement, generally known as the "electric candle." Instead of placing the carbon points one above the other, as in all previous arrangements, he placed them side by side, with some insulating material between, so that they might be mechanically in contact, but electrically separated. A temporary connection is made at the outset by uniting the two carbon rods at the top, but once the arc is established it will continue to play without interruption until the carbon is exhausted. There are many ingenious details in this invention for regulating the wearing away of the two rods, but they are of so technical a nature that space will not allow us to notice them.

The electric lighting of the streets of Paris which has lately attracted so much attention was effected by the Jablochhoff candle. The long rows of white houses which are so distinguishing a feature of Paris have added not a little to the effect by forming an admirable background, while the eye is caught by numerous points of brilliant light. The effect in the judgment of even the most prejudiced was very striking. It may be owing to the absence of some reflecting background that the Jablochhoff candle succeeded so badly on the Victoria Embankment in London. Its failure was even greater in Billingsgate Market; the unfortunate fishmongers were unable to detect the shades of colour on their fish, while a curious complaint was heard on all sides that the new light was so cold!

Mr. Werderman has recently patented a form of lamp in which the carbon points are not separated, as in other arrangements, but by suitable mechanical device kept in immediate contact. The inventor claims as the special features in his lamp, the low electro-motive power required, while the light is of so soft a character that it appears unnecessary to protect it by globes of opaque glass.

Messrs. Ladd & Co. have recently exhibited at the Liverpool Street Station a form of lamp known after the name of its inventor, Mr. Wallace, of Connecticut. It differs from all others in the use of large rectangular slabs of carbon instead of thin rods. As soon as the current is connected, an electro-magnet is brought into action which pulls the two slabs just sufficiently asunder to allow the arc to play. The light is produced in the ordinary way, but as the positive pole at any particular point wears away, the separation between the slabs becomes too great for the arc to play—a connection is consequently set up with the neighbouring part of the positive carbon, and the light is continued without interruption. In this manner the luminous arc traverses the whole length of the slab, until it reaches the end, when it makes a turn and pursues its course in the opposite direction with the same result. It is clear that by this arrangement the light can be maintained for a considerable time without requiring attendance or change of carbon. In fact, it is maintained by the

exhibitors that their lamps have been known to last for over a hundred hours.

No inventor, however, has as yet succeeded in bringing forward an electric light suitable for domestic purposes. The light so far produced is too brilliant, too costly, and too wasteful of electro-motive power for anything but large spaces or buildings. Nothing but a moderately brilliant light, cheap and simple in its working, can ever hope to supersede gas in our homes. Should the fortunate discoverer arise who shall succeed in dividing the electric light, the advantages of electric lighting are so great, in cleanliness, in security from danger, in healthiness, that they must lead to its general adoption.

BOOKS ON SCIENCE.

The Evolution of Man. From the German of ERNST HAECKEL.
London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

THIS is a work well adapted for what is its evident purpose. Its purpose is to propagate amongst those interested in Natural History, but devoid of special scientific knowledge, a persuasion that Mr. Darwin's view as to our origin is a demonstrable truth, and that Christianity is a fable, and even theism a dream, from which science must awaken us.

The author gives a readable, interesting, and, on the whole, substantially accurate account of such parts of the animal kingdom as enter into what he regards as our genealogical table, beginning with the lowest unicellular organisms and thence passing by sponges, various worms, the ascidians, the amphioxus, sharks, amphibians, and beasts through monkeys up to man.

Especially interesting and instructive is his account of the processes of development which take place in different kinds of animals. This is very clearly given and is exceedingly well illustrated. A discovery of these processes is the most recent acquisition of biological science, and is one yet far from complete, though great advances have been made. It has long been known that the matter of the fertilized egg undergoes a process of spontaneous subdivision or yolk-cleavage, but it has only of late been discovered that the subdivided portions (whether equal or unequal in size) sooner or later arrange themselves in a double layer, called a *gastrula*, and which may be cup-shaped or discoidal.

Professor Haeckel, in the first place, divides animals (from this point of view) into (A) those in which the whole of the yolk undergoes segmentation (as is the case *e.g.* in frogs and beasts) and (B) those in which only a part so divides (as in the fowl's egg), the rest being known as the "nutritive yolk." He further subdivides section A into those in which the yolk divides into equal portions, and those in which its divisions are unequal. Section B he subdivides into those in which the partial segmentation takes place at one portion of the sur-

face of the yolk only, and those in which it takes place superficially over the whole circumference.

His statements as to the conditions presented by different groups of animals, in this respect, may be tabulated as follows:—a list which we feel may be welcome and useful to such of our readers as may take interest in zoology.

Complete yolk cleavage.	Equal cleavage —a cup-shaped gastrula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Most <i>Cœlentera</i> (low <i>Sponges</i>, <i>Hydropolypts</i>, <i>Medusæ</i>, <i>Corals</i>). b. <i>Sagitta</i>, <i>Phoronis</i>, <i>Ascidia</i>, many <i>Neuratodes</i>. c. <i>Terebratula</i>, <i>Argiope</i>, <i>Pisidium</i>. d. Most <i>Echinoderma</i>. e. A few <i>Arthropods</i> (e.g., <i>Branchiopods</i>, <i>Copepods</i>, <i>Tardigrades</i>). f. <i>Amphioxus</i>.
	Unequal cleavage —a hood-shaped gastrula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Many <i>Sponges</i>, <i>Medusæ</i>, and <i>Corals</i>, <i>Siphonophores</i>, <i>Otenophoræ</i>. b. Most <i>Worms</i>. c. Most <i>Mollusca</i>. d. Individual <i>Echinoderms</i>. e. A few low <i>Arthropods</i>. f. <i>Cyclostomes</i>, <i>Ganoids</i>, <i>Amphibia</i>, <i>Mammals</i>.
Partial yolk cleavage.	Discoidal cleavage —a disk-shaped gastrula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Cephalopoda</i>. b. Some <i>Arthropods</i> (e.g., <i>Milipedes</i>, <i>Scorpions</i>). c. <i>Selachii</i>, <i>Teleostei</i>, <i>Reptiles</i>, <i>Birds</i> (and <i>Monotremes</i> ?).
	Superficial cleavage —a bladder-like gastrula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A few <i>Sponges</i>? <i>Alcyonium</i> ? b. Individual kinds of <i>Worms</i>. c. Most <i>Arthropods</i>, of all classes.

As we have said, though the work is a clear and able exposition of facts, they are so presented, *ad captandam vulgus*, as to lead the unwary to conclude that they demonstrate the truth of the author's conclusions—which, it need hardly be said, they are very far from doing. But in addition to a skilful marshalling of facts, he treats us to a variety of fictions—many animals being spoken of by him as real, which have absolutely no other evidence for their being than their being needed to support the Darwinian theory as to man. Mere speculations and assumptions are often presented in the guise of ascertained truths. As an example of a piece of romance of this kind the following passage (from vol ii. p. 116) may be taken:—

It was undoubtedly a branch of the Primitive Fishes (*Selachii*) which during the Devonian Period made the first successful effort to accustom itself to terrestrial life, and to breathe atmospheric air. In this the swimming-bladder was especially of service, for it succeeded in adapting itself to respiration of air, and so became a lung. The immediate consequence of this was the modification of the heart and nose.

Sometimes positive errors are to be detected; thus, he says (vol. ii. p. 130) that such *Axolotes* as transform themselves into the *Amblystoma* condition “become sexually mature,” whereas, in fact, the sexual

glands atrophy when this apparently adult form of life is attained to. Again, he says (vol. ii. p. 161), that some of the short-footed semi-apes "approach very near to true apes," which is a statement the reverse of the fact. Again (vol. i. p. 349), he tells us that "the earliest primitive vertebræ . . . are the first and second neck vertebræ, then come the third and fourth, and so on." Such, however, is not the case. The neck vertebræ are not formed from before backwards, but are an intercalation—the middle ones coming last.

Occasionally he ventures on statements which he must know are untrue. Thus he affirms (vol. ii. p. 170) that "many tribes among the lower races of men, especially many negro tribes, use the foot in the same way as the hand. In consequence of early habit and continued practice they are able to grasp as well with the foot as with the hand." Now the author, as an accomplished anatomist, *must* well know that no man of any race opposes the great-toe to the other digits as he opposes the thumb to the fingers, or as the gorilla and all other apes and half-apes oppose the great-toe to the other digits of the foot. The foot-grasping which some men effect is performed in another way, and in no case can they "grasp as well with the foot as with the hand."

The antitheistic animus of Professor Haeckel appears again and again. No one with any natural knowledge could suppose that the small wing of the apteryx or the hidden teeth of young whales can be any inconvenience to those animals. Yet, speaking of such "rudimentary organs," he permits himself to say (vol. ii. p. 439) that but for evolution "it would be impossible to understand why the Creator should have laid this useless burden on his creatures in their life-journey, so arduous at the best."

His anti-Christian prejudice sometimes rises to a degree of absurdity truly sublime—as when he claims "the devoutest reverence" for the little worm-like fish, the lancelet or *amphioxus*. He tells us (vol. i. p. 464) "the *amphioxus* (skull-less, brainless, and memberless as it is) deserves all respect as being our own flesh and blood! At any rate, the *amphioxus* has better right to be an object of profoundest admiration and of devoutest reverence than any one in that worthless rabble of so-called 'saints,' in whose honour our 'civilized' and 'enlightened,' cultured nations erect temples and decree processions."

The amount of freedom which Christians might hope to enjoy under the rule of "Liberals,"—save the mark!—such as Professor Haeckel, he makes sufficiently evident. In his preface (p. xxii.) he laments that "the State" yet "permits" the existence of "celibacy" (!), but consoles himself by the charitable and truly liberal reflection: "We do, indeed, now enjoy the unusual pleasure of seeing 'most Christian bishops and Jesuits, exiled and imprisoned for their disobedience to the laws of the State.'" Comment on this passage would be superfluous.

From one point of view his hostility to Christianity is less blameworthy on account of his ignorance of it, though from another he is specially guilty for not taking the trouble to make himself acquainted

with the tenets of those upon whom he does not scruple to call down the sword of persecution.

One or two instances may suffice to demonstrate this culpable ignorance. He has evidently heard that according to our doctrine man has been made in God's image and likeness, but he has never taken the trouble to inquire in what this likeness consists. Had he done so he could never have written the following lines:—"There are many persons who believe that the 'image of God' is unmistakably reflected in their own features. If the nosed-ape shared in this singular opinion, he would hold it with a better right than some snub-nosed persons" (vol i. p. 374).

The Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady comes in, as might perhaps be anticipated, for an ignorant sneer. He tells us (vol i. p. 170), "among Vertebrates, 'Virginal generation' never occurs. This we must explicitly affirm in the face of the celebrated dogma of the Immaculate Conception"!

Again, he utterly misconceives the teaching of the Church as to the soul and the body and the separable distinctness of the former, confounding in his ignorant dogmatism the "Mind" with the "Soul!" He speaks of (vol ii. p. 451) the dualistic view "which denies the inseparable connection of the brain and the mind and regards body and mind as entirely separate and distinct." Apparently he never heard that the "Mind" is the rational soul acting intellectually while united with the body.

But it is not only confident assertion based upon ignorance in religious matters which merits note. Hardly less noteworthy is the mode in which Professor Haeckel, like so many of his school, makes mere words and phrases do duty as an explanation of phenomena when the only other possible explanation is one which the dogmas of their narrow sect forbid them to employ. Thus he makes the word "Adaptation" serve as an explanation, and what it denotes, as a *vera causa* of whole groups of phenomena. He lays down (vol. i. p. 158) the following remarkable dictum:—"Adaptation, the most important vital function, is directly connected with nutrition, and plays the most important part in the progressive development of the organism. It is in reality the most influential cause (!) of every advance and of all perfection of the organism. Adaptation effects all the modifications or variations which organic forms undergo under the influence of the external conditions of existence; it is the true cause (!) of every modification."

In a similar way he regards (vol. i. p. 169) the operation of "a change in the nutrition of the tissue" at the point of the bone of the forehead in a four-horned goat as "an explanation" of the phenomenon. But what requires explanation is that very local change in the nutritive processes which this most shallow philosopher regards as itself an explanation.

With such views it is hardly necessary to say that Professor Haeckel displays the most utter ignorance of psychology, and has not even the perception of what needs to be proved psychologically in order to establish his account of the origin of man. It has rarely been our lot

to encounter a book so redolent of self-satisfied ignorance and arrogant contempt for views which lie beyond the horizon of the writer's mental vision. This man abuses religion without taking the trouble to acquire the most ordinary information concerning it, confounds the "Soul" with the "Mind," takes no note of man's power of abstraction; but with ridiculous dogmatism decries others whilst palming on the readers mere empty phrases like "adaptation," as *veræ causæ*, and as sufficient explanation of the more varied phenomena which the active worlds of vegetable and animal life ceaselessly present to our loving and reverent admiration.

O.

Final Causes. By PAUL JANET. Translated from the French, by WILLIAM AFFLECK, B.D. T. T. Clark, Edinburgh.

THE work of M. Paul Janet on "Final Causes," recently translated by William Affleck, B.D., seems to have won for its author the greatest honour in his own country for its universally acknowledged ability and thoroughness, and bids fair to be considered the standard work of our times on the argument of Design. We heartily recommend it to the perusal of such as have had the misfortune to be unsettled by the infidel *physics* of the day.

The writer combines the advantage of a knowledge of physical and metaphysical science—a qualification as valuable as it is rare—and, without expressly aiming at it, makes the reader understand how it is possible that a student of Nature could ever be tempted to be an atheist. The account is, the *warp of the mind exercised only in the one point of view*; and the remedy is the other point of view—*Final Causes*.

A Final Cause is that which in the work as it exists is *effect*, but, in the mind of the contriver of the work is the end (*finis*) intended by him, was the motive which induced him to work at all; and, in this sense, the cause of the work—*e.g.*, the end or purpose of cutting, is the cause of the knife, the trituration of the food, the cause of the molar teeth. But then, it has been said, given the efficient cause or causes, the work would be produced just the same, though the end had not been intended; thus, a steel blade of graduated tenuity would still cut, though that effect had not been intended by the maker, and, given the construction of the molar teeth, they would equally grind, though they had not been designed for grinding.

Now, in the workmanship of man, that there are final causes is an indisputable fact: but are there final causes in Nature? Will you say, in short, that the bird flies because it has wings, or that it has wings in order that it may fly? Doubtless the reader will see no incompatibility in the two statements, and will answer, with M. Janet, that both are true; but the reasons for the former and the latter statement are somewhat different. That birds fly because they have wings, rests on the law of causation, but that they have wings in order that they may fly, rests on a principle which applies the law of causation not only to the phenomena themselves, but to the *order* of the pheno-

mena; since the order of the phenomena equally postulates a cause as the phenomena themselves. He who does not see this distinction, but thinks that he has exhausted the principle of causation, when he has simply registered the facts, and assigned them to their respective physical cause or causes, reminds the author of a man, instanced by Gassendi, who hearing the clock strike four, and being half-asleep, exclaimed, "That clock has gone mad: it has struck one o'clock four times over!" The man was awake to the *sound*, and to the *cause*, but asleep to the significance of the *group*.

The anecdote is very applicable to a certain class of thinkers (?) who conceive that they want no divine idea to account for the works of Nature, just because they have the laws and the facts. There are the organs that conspire to form the organism, the tissues that compose the organs, the cells that compose the tissues; what do you want with design? As who should say: "Look at that piano"—(the simile is M. Janet's)—"Do you think it was contrived to subserve the musician's art? Be assured that that is a superficial and quite popular explanation. Strings, wood, ivory—these are its anatomical elements, and each of these elements has essential and immanent properties. Thus, the strings have the property of vibration, the wood that of resonance, and so forth. What wonder, then, if the machine should serve for the production of musical sound, *since the elements which compose it have the properties necessary to produce that effect!*"

If this in truth be the method of physical science, and not a caricature, and, if it rest there, if it do not invoke a natural metaphysic to its aid—for we all of us think and talk metaphysics oftentimes without knowing it)—why, preferable surely is the *indocta ignorantia* of Sganarelle, who thus speaks, as M. Janet cites him, to the unbelieving Don Juan: "I have not studied like you, thank God, and no one could ever boast of having taught me anything; but, with my small sense—with my small judgment—I see things better than books, and understand very well that this world that we see is not a mushroom that has come of itself in a night. I would ask you *who* has made these trees, these rocks, this earth, and yonder sky above? and whether all that has made itself? Can you see all the inventions of which the human machine is composed, without admiring the way in which it is arranged one part with another? these nerves, bones, veins, arteries, these lungs, this heart, this liver? My reasoning is that there is something wonderful in man, whatever you may say, which all the *savants* cannot explain."*

It would far exceed the limits of a notice like the present to give even a sketch of the application of the theory to its final proof of the existence of a supra-mundane Deity; we have merely considered the fundamental principle on which the argument is based, which, suffice it to say, is illustrated and defended with an ability and learning which must command the reader's admiration; though, in so large a work, it is unlikely that every detail will meet with equal approval. We trust it will do good in the quarter where it is needed.

* "Le Festin de Pierre," act iii., scene i. (cited p. 321).

The translation is idiomatic, in general, and one is rarely reminded that it is a translation. But the *shalls* and *wills*, *woulds* and *shoulds*, are respectively interchanged, *passim*; the almost obsolete verb *behave* is used nearly everywhere for *must*, and as a verb personal; while the odd looking participle "awanting" is of far too frequent occurrence. May we hope that these defects will disappear in a future edition?

The Freedom of Science in the Modern State. By RUDOLF VIRCHOW, M.D.
Translated from the German, and Revised by the Author. 2nd edit. London: John Murray, 1878.

Un-science, not Science, adverse to Faith. A Sermon by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford: Parker, 1878.

THE lecture by Dr. Virchow, which made some noise after its delivery, before a meeting of Naturalists, at Munich, on September 22nd of last year, is mainly a protest against the attempt to introduce atheistic and materialist theories into education under the name of truth and science. Dr. Rudolph Virchow is a man of European eminence as a physician, a lecturer on medicine, and a discoverer in pathology and physiology. The theory most widely connected with his name is that of the "cellular hypothesis" in pathology—that every cell is derived from a cell, a theory which its author would apply, apparently, throughout the whole organic kingdom. Virchow is a politician and a literary man as well as a professor. In the former capacity he was once challenged to a duel by Count von Bismarck. In the latter he has printed a lecture, in which such "aggressive" scientists as Hückel, Nägeli, and Klebs are roundly and ably called to account. He is not, certainly, a champion of orthodoxy; but he seems to have kept much of his common sense, even if he has shifted away further and further, like Professor Tyndall, from the poor anchorage where he found himself moored when he opened his eyes on this perplexing scene. Dr. Hückel, whose province it is to out-Darwin Mr. Darwin himself, seems to have read a paper at the meeting of the German Association of Naturalists and Physicists above alluded to, in which he insisted that protoplasm explained life and thought, and abolished the idea of God; and he declared that nothing would satisfy him until that great truth was *taught in every school in the land*. It was to protest against this that Dr. Virchow, at the same meeting, delivered extemporaneously the address, the English translation of which is now before us. To most of us the fact that it was delivered at all is the most interesting thing about it. But it is instructive also to observe how far Virchow goes, and where he draws the line. He expresses in very forcible language the absurdity and unreasonableness of the demand to introduce into the education of the young a theory which its own supporters confess to be unproved, and hardly capable of proof. He says very truly that the teaching of the Protoplasmic Soul (*die Plastidul-Seele*) would be equivalent to a new revelation and a new religion. But he is prepared to anticipate a considerable revolution in current thought and in education from the gradual advance of science. He will not say that, some

day or other, it may not be possible to bring psychical processes into an immediate connection with those which are physical—that is, to show that thought and will and morality are “secretions,” or atomic changes. He would not be astonished if it were one day proved that man was developed from the ape, or from some other “point” in the vertebrate kingdom. He does not even reject the *Plastidul-Seele* as impossible of demonstration, though he evidently regards with repressed scorn the wild war-whoops of Hæckel, who cuts and bruises himself like any priest of Baal in calling upon the god which he has made up out of “Carbon and Company.” Thus, Dr. Virchow is as remote as it is possible for a man to be from the principle of Christian belief, or from sound mental and spiritual philosophy; and we must use his words as we would use the words of an antagonist, to stop the mouths of those who believe in him, and would go still further than he goes.

From this point of view many of his admissions are useful. He considers it to be beyond all doubt that what he calls “psychical” phenomena, or what are generally called intellectual operations, exist only in the higher animals, and “only with full certainty in the highest.” And he enters his decided protest against the attempt to set up what he calls a *possible* connection as a *doctrine* of science. He claims to be making, at this moment, a special study of Anthropology, and what he says on this head will, therefore, have very great weight. “I am bound to declare,” he says, “that every positive advance which we have made in the province of pre-historic anthropology has actually removed us further from the proof” of a connection between man and the lower animals. The existence of man in the Tertiary period, he says, is still a problem. He can be proved to have existed in the Quaternary; but no advance or development in man has taken place since that time. When we study the fossil man of the Quaternary period, “we always find a man just as men are now.” “There is a complete absence of any fossil type of a lower stage in the development of man.” He maintains that there are relatively more low-typed men now than there are found among the fossils. Perhaps it is only the geniuses of the Quaternary period that have been preserved! As to our connection with the Ape, “not a single fossil skull of an ape or of an ape-man has yet been found that could really have belonged to a human being.” And he concludes: “We cannot teach, we cannot pronounce it to be a conquest of science, that man descends from the Ape or from any other animal.” Perhaps these protests from the mouth of an eminent authority will do something towards teaching the younger generation the virtue of modesty. If theory was always labelled as theory, and speculation described by its proper name, half of the “conflict” between science and religion would never occur. Whilst Mr. Darwin himself admits that his Evolution theory is not proved, and Professor Tyndall confesses that it is probable we shall never fill up all the gaps in it, whoever holds it should hold it as a theory, and modify it so as to fit facts which *are* proved and certain—the facts of the Christian revelation.

The sermon written by Dr. Pusey, and delivered for him by Canon

Liddon at Oxford, aims at showing that true Science cannot contradict Revelation. It is only when Science steps out of its provinces and theorizes on matters which go beyond experience—in a word when it becomes “Un-science,”—that it can come across Theology. The author has accumulated an immense mass of citations, which will, perhaps, prove useful to students. The sermon, however, is not very clear or pointed. The style of a sermon, with its interrogative rhetoric and its pious solemnity, is not exactly fitted for the discussion of Darwin’s views about species, or Hæckel’s pedigree of protoplasm. One wants exact theology, intelligible philosophy, and definite admissions or denials. Dr. Pusey knows so much, that he can only exhibit a comparatively small number of specimens of his wealth of knowledge; but it often happens that what he puts forth to the world is a collection without a key or a catalogue—the *nexus* which makes them an orderly whole (if such a *nexus* exists) being kept hidden in his mind. The impression left, however, after reading this sermon—(in which, we may mention, Dr. Virchow’s Address is several times quoted)—is that, in Dr. Pusey’s opinion, Science is very rash in its dogmatism, and that there are many reasons for believing in the existence of God and of a spiritual human soul. Some of the younger members of the University, who heard the Sermon, seem to have asked the author whether he accounted the *animal* derivation of the *body* of man to be a theory contradictory to Revelation, and would, on theological grounds, hold it to be impossible that Science could establish it. His answer is this: “If Science could prove that our race was born of an ape-mother, one should (would?) be forced to the belief, that God took away at once all the propensities which it had by ‘the law of inheritance,’ and gave it a soul, made in His own likeness; but . . . that mythological part of Darwinism must continue to be only a theory . . . and cannot become a Science.”

Education as a Science. By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D. (International Scientific Series). London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1878.

Education, Intellectual, Moral, and Physical. By HERBERT SPENCER. Cheap edition. London: Williams and Norgate, 1878.

Lettres sur l'Education des Filles. Par Mgr. DUPANLOUP, Evêque d'Orleans. Paris: Jules Gervais, 1879.

THE old definition of a science used to be the knowledge of a subject by its causes; which is to say, an orderly exposition of the philosophical laws of any branch of human inquiry, resting on some law practically ultimate. Therefore, a scientific treatise on education involves a definition of education. You cannot define education by a mere exposition of facts connected with mind and body, heart and brain.

What is the use of saying that education is “the harmonious and equable evolution of the human powers”—which is the definition given by the founders of the Prussian national system—unless you

first understand what is the "harmony" and the "equability" among them which you are to aim at? James Mill, in the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*," laid down the end of education to be (as Professor Bain quotes him) "to render the individual, as much as possible, an instrument of happiness, first to himself and next to other beings." But what is happiness? Who has a right to prescribe to a child the way in which he ought to be happy? The younger Mill talks about the "perfection of our nature." But that, again, raises a bottomless question—to him and his school. Professor Bain fairly gives up the search for a definition of education, and thinks he will have done enough if he considers, first, as many mental processes as he can get names for; and, secondly, the branches of education which most people agree in thinking education ought to include, and treating these "scientifically"—that is, with strict deference to observed facts. The result is an uncommonly dry book. A few useful practical hints may, doubtless, be picked up here and there; but moral and emotional topics are treated in such a hard, economical and earthy spirit, that one cannot help pitying the unfortunate children whom Professor Bain's admirers may take in hand. Here is one of his prognostications in regard to punishment: "It is in graduated artificial inflictions, operating directly on the nerves by means of electricity, that we may look for the physical punishments of the future, that are to displace floggings and muscular torture" (p. 62).

Mr. Herbert Spencer devotes his first chapter to a detailed proof that all education ought to have for its subject-matter, science—that is, physical science. Of the numerous heresies and heterodoxies into which he strays in working out this conclusion we have no need to speak. The question which naturally occurs to most people is, How can science teach a child its last end, or its religion? Mr. Spencer has provided the answer. Science is religious—essentially, emphatically religious; for science "generates a profound respect for, and an implicit faith in, those uniformities of action which all things disclose" (p. 46); besides, it leads us clearly to recognise "the impossibility of comprehending the ultimate cause of things, by bringing us in every direction to boundaries we cannot pass" (p. 47). If any one objects that this is not religion but agnosticism, Mr. Herbert Spencer is sorry for him. His book, however, is interesting, amusing, and, in several details, useful enough. It is written rather on the side of the children against the parents; and Mr. Spencer's young people will have good times in matters of eating and drinking and of "experimentally" finding out what they should not do, and in a general disappearance of learning by rote and by "rules." But it is consoling to know that he utterly disapproves of Lord Palmerston's reckless dogma that "all children are born good" (p. 96).

The book of the late lamented Bishop of Orleans on the Education of Girls consists of a series of letters, which appear, from the words of Abbé Lagrange, in the introduction, to have been really addressed to parents, teachers, and children, but which the Bishop put together at Hyères during the last days of his life. It is refreshing after

wandering in the pathless and dry lands of Scotch philosophers and English physicists to turn over pages which begin with the Christian answer to the question, Why did God make you? The present work, however, although it rests on the immovable basis of Christian principle, is not precisely on education, but on the education of girls. The bishop, an educator from the earliest years of his priesthood, could not help being struck by the frivolity and ignorance of the greater number of the women of the better classes. The larger part of this work is taken up with impressing on women, by maxim, by reasoning, by history, and by example, the importance—nay, the simple necessity—of labour and of intellectual occupation. In the second part, the eloquent and earnest writer gives a great deal of excellent practical advice to those engaged in bringing up girls. Some of his strictures on the way that some boarding-schools and convents try to make girls pious are especially well-timed. All school-mistresses and nuns should read the two letters on Piety. He thinks that girls are often very “pious” and well-behaved with very little solid and real virtue. They have a pretty chapel, pretty music, and sweetly-spoken “sisters,” and their hearts and imaginations are warmed by it all; they are directed and encouraged to perform a number of “pious” practices; but their serious defects of character—their laziness, vanity, dissipation, or selfishness—are very much let alone; their piety is routine, and when the routine vanishes, no spontaneity exists to take its place; they have had “the rule” dinned into their ears, and when “the rule” is over the Gospel is not there to keep them straight; their school education has given them one or two school virtues, perhaps, but not prepared them to be good in their own families and in the world. As a very wise priest said, it does not do to bring up school-girls like novices; they should be more under the priest and less under the nuns, or else they run the risk of being formalists at school, and of never looking for any direction at all as soon as they have left school.

As the last work of Bishop Dupanloup, these thoughtful and beautifully-expressed letters will be widely read.

Le Téléphone, le Microphone, et le Phonographe. Par Le Comte Th. du MONCEL, Membre de l'Institut (Bibliothèque des Merveilles). 2me edition. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}, 1878.

THE idea of transmitting sound to a distance, the author says, is as old as the world. The Greeks employed means of doing it, which they sometimes used in their oracles; but they did not get beyond tubes and speaking trumpets. The most ancient document suggesting clearly the telephonic idea dates back to the year 1667. In it one Dr. Robert Hooke says confidently that by using a tightened string sound can be instantly passed to a great distance, “if not as rapidly as light, incomparatively more quickly than sound travels in the air.” This idea is the basis of the “string” telephone, which came, however, long after. Who first invented it is not known; a large number of dealers all claim it for themselves. If certain travellers may be

believed, this "string" system has long been in vogue in Spain for love correspondence.

The notion of applying electric action to this sort of transmission ought to have come as soon as the marvellous effects of the electric telegraph were witnessed; but up to 1854 no one dared think it possible, and when M. Charles Bourseul published, at that date, his notice on the electric transmission of sound, people thought the idea a fanciful dream. This idea, however, bore the germ of the invention which has illustrated the names of Graham Bell and Elisha Gray. In 1876 the problem of electric transmission was at last solved; and the solution has raised a dispute as to the priority between the two last-named inventors. Indeed, the question is at present under discussion in the Supreme Court of the American Patents. It would appear that M. Charles Bourseul has the priority of idea, and that Mr. Bell has perfected the speaking telephone.

After this slight historical sketch the author of the work before us enters on long, but interesting, clearly put, and abundantly illustrated, accounts of the various instruments at present before the world. His first section is devoted to "Musical Telephones." First, that of M. Reiss, invented in 1860. One end of this instrument is provided with a large circular aperture, into which any instrument may be played or the voice may sing. The transmission is electrical. Messrs. Cecil and Leonard Wray are the authors of an instrument perfecting that of M. Reiss. The telephone of Mr. Elisha Gray, of Chicago, adds to the former "musical" instruments an important modification by which it can be adopted to telegraphy. All these and other instruments for the distant transmission of musical sounds are described at length.

Then we have "speaking" telephones, beginning with the stringed ones, the vendors of which have inundated the streets of every European city for some time back. We learn that they transmit easily 150 yards; that silk strings are the best, hemp the worst; they are generally made of cotton for sake of cheapness.

The electric telephone of Mr. Graham Bell was shown at the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876. Sir W. Thompson called it the "wonder of wonders." Mr. Bell declares that the discovery was not a spontaneous happy conception, but was the result of long and patient researches on acoustics and the labours of physicists in that direction. A lucid but somewhat lengthy description is given both of Bell's and Elisha Gray's instruments.

Some people imagine that because Bell's telephone has not an electric pile it is not an electric instrument. The electric power, however, is produced by the action of magnets on a circuit. When well made this instrument gives very satisfactory results; speech is transmitted with the utmost clearness of tone and articulation. As in speaking to the deaf, so in speaking into the telephone, shouting goes for little; the thing is, to intone clearly and articulate well.

Mr. Edison finished, in 1876, an improvement on Bell's telephone. It is a pile telephone; it is less susceptible, in transmitting, to adverse

influences from without, and operates to a far greater distance. Mr. Edison, also, does away with a liquid conductor, and makes use of carbon. At the trials of his instrument on a telegraph line between New York and Philadelphia, and later between the Paris Exhibition and Versailles, the results have been satisfactory. The telephones of Colonel Navez, of Messrs. Pollard and Garnier, of M. Hellesen, of Messrs. Thomson and Houston, and several others are described in succession.

Next come some modifications of the general idea. First, those formed by a combination of several diaphragms in one instrument. Each diaphragm being accompanied by its own electro-magnetic organ, and the induction currents of all being united, the effect at the receiving end is intensified; the result equalling the combined transmissions, as a chorus equals the combined voices. Under this head the different inventions of Messrs. E. Gray, Phelps, Cox-Walker, Trouvé, and Demoget are described.

Certain experiments are next detailed, which have been made to determine how far each part of the instrument is essential. It would appear that almost every part may, under certain conditions, transmit the sound; and a telephone made without the vibrating plate was shown by Mr. Millar at the meeting of the British Association for 1878, in Dublin.

Among the many interesting experiments made with the telephone related here one is that of M. d'Arsonval, who wished to ascertain the degree of sensitiveness of this instrument. He compared it with that of a frog's nerve, which has been hitherto regarded as the most perfect of galvanoscopes. The result showed that the telephone was two hundred times more sensitive than the frog! Last among the experiments comes one which the author tells us, "*tout le monde peut faire.*" A telephone is applied to any part of the body in the vicinity of the chest, even outside one's clothes; then, the loudly spoken words of a person so treated are duly transmitted; "which makes it pretty clear that all the human body participates in the vibrations caused by speaking." In this case the vibrations are mechanically transmitted through the body to the connected instrument.

The applications, already made or contemplated, of the telephone to various useful purposes are next noticed. For domestic uses a telephone is cheaper and more useful than acoustic tubing, and can be better hid from view. The difference in cost of laying down the apparatus is, we are told, "already as 1 to 7." The electro-magnetic are the best, and always ready for working; they will probably soon accompany all electric bells in hotels and other large places. They promise to be still more useful in the fire-brigade service.

In the army they have so far not been a success in field operations by reason of surrounding noises: but they are already a proved success and a great boon in rifle and artillery practice. The advantages, neither few nor small, which the telephone gives promise of rendering to the marine services, especially in regard to torpedoes, to the inspec-

tion and working of mines, and to the advance of science through the perfection of experiments, are described at length.

A full account of the Microphone comes next. The author regrets the dispute between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Edison as to their claims to its invention, which has, he says, no *raison d'être*. The microphone is certainly only the "transmitter" of an Edison pile telephone, but altogether differently arranged, acting differently and constructed to serve a different purpose. The microphone magnifies the sound received; hence its name. But the microphone does not altogether act towards feeble sounds as does the microscope towards minute illumined objects. The former amplifies only the sounds resulting from vibrations which are mechanically transmitted to the apparatus by solid bodies. So the stepping of a fly across the "support" of the apparatus was like the tramping of a horse, and Mr. Hughes says the fly's death cry was audible. When a musical box was placed on the support, the clanging was so loud that the sounds could not be distinguished. The different varieties of the instrument are then explained. Useful, if not revolutionizing, applications of it, are projected, to telegraphy, to science, in the study of vibrations imperceptible to the senses, to medicine and surgery, in the stethoscope, &c., and to commerce.

Lastly, this charming book describes the Phonograph. "Mr. Edison's phonograph, which has engrossed so much attention for months past, is an apparatus which not only registers the different vibrations caused by speech on the vibrating plate, but also reproduces the speech according to the registered tracings." It is this last feature which is the great achievement of its inventor. M. Léon Scott had already, in 1856, invented his *Phonautographe* which successfully performed the first part of the operation: in which, also, early in 1877, M. Ch. Cros had been successful. Again, also before Mr. Edison, Messrs. Napoli and Marcel Duprez had endeavoured to construct a phonograph so unsuccessfully as to have concluded that the reproduction of speech from a mechanical tracing was an insoluble problem. Since hearing of Mr. Edison's achievement they have resumed their labours "and give us hope that some day they will present us with a still more perfect phonograph than Mr. Edison's." The phonograph consists chiefly of a registering cylinder turned by hand, in front of which is fixed a vibrating plate; above the latter is a telephone mouth-piece, whilst below it is a tracing point. The cylinder being set in motion, the operator speaks into the mouth-piece: the vibrations thus caused to the plate are communicated to the tracing needle, which in turn embosses them on a thin sheet of metal fastened to the cylinder. The speech ended, the sheet may be removed and kept in a portfolio for a future occasion. When it is desired to reproduce the speech the process is exactly reversed; the traced sheet is replaced on the cylinder, the needle-point put back into the groove it formerly made, the cylinder is set in motion and the needle carries back to the plate the vibrations it had before carried to the plate from the needle. There are other

models of the phonograph which the author describes, but they are on the same principle. At present a phonograph will trace 150 to 200 words per minute. This speed in writing and speaking instrumentally will at once suggest the line of application which its inventor believes will be most important, in letter writing, lecturing, electrotype, composition, &c. A person may read a book into the Phonograph; afterwards it may be read off at leisure or at any time by a large number of blind persons. It is impossible to forecast the future development, and the revolutions in social and domestic life, resulting from the three great inventions so graphically described in this little volume—the Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph. A translation of the work is published by Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

(By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.)

1. **T**HE February issue of the *Katholik* opens with a learned article by Father Schneemann, S. J., on "Molinism and Congruism." F. Schneemann ranks amongst the best scholars the Society of Jesus has given us since its re-establishment in Germany. Fourteen years ago he published a very clever dissertation on Pope Honorius, a man who has been so much calumniated, and so seldom dispassionately understood, and vindicated him from error in teaching the faith. Afterwards he expounded several of the theses of the Syllabus, and amongst them principally those which concern the Church as a perfect society, independent of the State, her liberty and her rights; also several questions of canon law about matrimony. But, above all, Father Schneemann has deserved well of the Catholic cause, and secured for himself a world-wide fame, as principal editor of the "*Acta et decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum recentiorum; collectio Lacensis, Friburgi, sumtibus Herder.*" Father Schneemann, in the above-named article of the *Katholik*, shows himself as well-versed in theology as he is in canon law. His aim is to defend his Society and the systems adopted by its scholars in reconciling divine prescience and human action, grace and liberty. In a former article in the *Katholik* on Thomism, Professor Rohling told us that the Thomist system was taught by S. Augustine and S. Thomas; following Billuart, he called the "*efficacia ab intrinseco*" a "*dogma theologicum proxime definibile,*" and anticipated that it might be defined by the Church. Father Schneemann very appropriately writes: "Both schools profess as obvious truth (1) that by His preventing grace God infallibly produces our good actions; (2) that these actions are nevertheless really free ones—free not only from external coercion, but also from

interior necessity." The whole controversy, therefore, is about the question, In what manner may these two apparently contradictory facts be reconciled? This question has not been thoroughly discussed by S. Thomas. One of the greatest commentators of the Angelic doctor, Cardinal Cajetan, writing on the question, says, "Concerning this doubt I have not found anything in S. Thomas." Neither has the question been treated by S. Augustine. But, as remarks the great Dominican, Soto, since the Protestants insisted on the infallible efficacy of grace, it necessarily became the duty of the Catholic divines to expatiate on that topic. In discharging this duty they proceeded in different ways, and the Thomists, towards the end of the sixteenth century, were divided into two branches, one called simply the "Thomist school," following Bannez, Alvarez, and Lemos, the other venerating as their masters, Molina, Suarez, and Bellarmin. Both parties claimed S. Thomas as patron. It was no want of intellect or malice of will which caused these divines, together with S. Francis of Sales, and S. Alphonsus Liguori, to adopt a system departing from that of the Thomists. S. Alphonsus simply declares that he follows the systems of Cardinal Norris and of Tournely.

In the March and April issues of the *Katholik* we are presented with two treatises on the doctrine held by Duns Scotus, the great leader of the Franciscan school, on the *essence and nature of bodies*, both inorganic and organic. Twenty years ago nobody could have anticipated that ere long there would come a time in which the contest which was so eagerly fought during the Middle Ages, would once more create dissensions. We suppose it is generally known that the question about the nature of bodies—whether they consist of indivisible atoms, or are made up of "matter and form"—has divided the professors and graduates of the Catholic University of Poitiers into two parties, one of which defends the atomic system espoused by modern science, whilst the other faithfully clings to the doctrine of Aristotle and S. Thomas. The fact that those philosophers and divines who are atomists claim as their patrôn Duns Scotus, gave rise to the above-mentioned treatises in the *Katholik*. Our author succeeds in clearly demonstrating that no essential difference on this point can be found between S. Thomas and Scotus, and that therefore the atomists in vain endeavour to protect themselves with the name of Duns Sotus. As to *inorganic* bodies, all the great mediæval doctors taught that they consist of matter and form, and Duns Scotus is so far from disclaiming this theory, that, on the contrary, he extends it to the human soul and the angels: whatever is created is, according to him, made up of matter and form, and, curiously enough, Scotus, following Avicbron, holds that the "matter" of spiritual beings is the same in substance as that of corporeal beings. But as the form in spiritual beings vivifies and penetrates them in a far higher degree than in corporeal beings, hence Duns Scotus concludes that the composition of matter and form in spiritual beings is not in any way at variance with their unity and simplicity. There is another difference between

S. Thomas and Duns Scotus—viz., that Scotus attributes to matter, although not yet influenced by the form, existence; but this difference exists more in words than in reality, as Scotus does not attribute actuality to matter in the same sense as S. Thomas, but only inasmuch as matter taken as reality differs from the form, and thus act and “form” are one and the same, and everything existing outside of its cause may be styled “act.” Hence, even the *materia prima*, as it is severed from, and exists independently of, its cause, may be so called. On the other side, S. Thomas considers act and form as identical ideas, and hence denies existence to matter before it is pervaded by the form. According to him, matter is never without form, although the form gives to the matter *not its material being*, but determines it to be a *certain* and *real* being. The result, however, is that, notwithstanding the alleged differences, there reigns a perfect harmony between the two great doctors, as both of them profess the old doctrine of *matter and form*. Proceeding to the doctrine of Scotus on the nature of *man*, we find that he exaggerates the old doctrine that soul and body constitute the human being, by attributing to the body a certain form independently from the soul, calling it “*forma corporeitatis*.” The principal reason on which he basis this theory is the state of our body after death. Assuming the soul as cause of the life of our body, it seems difficult to understand how the body after being left by the soul nevertheless preserves its form, since with the form disappears also being. As a new form does not enter the body, it follows that the body, by death, does not lose its proper form, which consequently must differ from the soul. Scotus was on that point opposed by S. Thomas, who refuted him in his treatise “*De Pluralitate Formarum*,” which has been commented on in our days by Father Cornoldi.

In the February issue of the *Katholik* I gave an account of Mr. Orby Shipley’s work, “*Principles of the Faith in Relation to Sin*,” and his conversion to the Catholic Church, principally insisting on the acuteness of the author’s reasoning, in pointing out the prominent principle of Catholicism, that of *authority*. The April issue publishes, according to the original found in the archives of Monte Cassino, a letter, unknown up to our time, addressed by S. Thomas of Aquino to the Abbot of that celebrated monastery. We cannot pass over in silence a learned book published by Canon Frint at Prague, about S. John of Nepomuk, which is very favourably criticised in the *Katholik*. As the real existence of S. John has been frequently attacked by infidel historians, Canon Frint, with the utmost diligence, has collected whatever has previously been published on this topic, and his dissertation may claim the great merit of having dispelled whatsoever doubts yet remained. In Bohemia it was always supposed that S. John suffered martyrdom in 1383. A doubt about the accuracy of that date was raised in 1754, when Antony of Wokum, suffragan of the Archbishop of Prague, returning home from Rome, brought with him the original of the denunciation sent in 1393 to the Holy See by Archbishop Jenstein against King Wenzel, and the cruelties he had indulged in against John Pomuk, “my spiritual Vicar.” Canon

Frint shows clearly that there are not, as was gratuitously asserted, two Johns of Nepomuk, but only one—viz., the one who was put to death in 1393; and, further, that it is this martyr whom the Church has canonized.

2. The *Historisch-politische Blätter*, in their issue of April 16, present us with a learned essay on the question whether the name of the great Apostle of Germany is in Latin *Bonifatius* or rather *Bonifacius*. A few years ago many German scholars began to style him "Bonifatius," deriving the name from "bonum fatum," and insisting chiefly on the fact that in the fifth and fourth centuries the name was generally spelt so. Our author, with the strongest possible arguments, defends the old spelling "Bonifacius," handed down to us from many centuries, and sanctioned by the official documents of the Church. Our Saint, at first called Winfred, was honoured with this new name by Pope Gregory II., who, in giving it to him, wished to recognize him as a bishop who already had performed good works, and was called upon to perform them again. S. Boniface is not the man of "bonum fatum," but the "vir bonorum operum." Who could suppose the Pope had hinted at the *fate* of the heathens? It is quite possible that De Rossi's "Inscriptiones Christianæ" testify to the spelling recently introduced in Germany; but nobody who is not quite a stranger in the epigraphy of the latter times of the Roman empire is ignorant that the carvers in marble or stone exhibit too much carelessness, or rather ignorance, to permit us to propose them as masters of orthography. The issue of April 1st has an able article (the sixth on this topic) on the present and future condition of the Established Anglican High Church, especially the "Catholic" party in it. Two other articles of greater length comment on the influence which the Freemasons are now beginning publicly to exercise in Belgium in legislation, particularly in the education question, and the recent attempts of the French freethinkers to secularize the school system and to sever its connection with the Church. The article on the French education system is a remarkable one, as it affords most accurate details on the immense benefits derived from schools conducted by religious orders, their number, the saving they are to the community, the flourishing and hopeful state of the Catholic universities, and the great evils Unavoidably connected with the State Lycées and Universities. One of the most lamentable evils is the utter want of discipline and the deficiency of self-denial and "education." A high German statesman is credited with the sentiment, "As soon as we get tired of the 'Cultur-kampf' we shall send it to France." May Catholic France be spared this cruel and dangerous trial! Two other articles treat on "The Present Position of the Elementary Schools in Germany." They involve many grave accusations against our modern elementary schools; children in great towns are treated according to the same system as those of the country; the dangerous principle, "*multa, sed non multum*," is adopted; children are too long detained at the school desks, which gives rise to a comparatively too quick development of mental culture, whilst that of the body is neglected, and, lastly, instruction is insensibly severed from "education" and

religion. "I am a sceptic as to the dogma generally believed in our days," said Governor Gratz-Braun, of St. Louis, in 1873, "that the system of education, adopted in our time, is a foundation for virtue and morality. I know it is an opinion generally held, that ignorance brings forth vice, and learning is the way to virtue; but facts openly refute this tenet."

3. The March issue of the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* opens with a dissertation by Father Lehmkuhl on "Interest and Usury," explaining the provisions of canon law, which prohibited any interest from a loan in money, as money was considered in the Middle Ages not to be "fruitful," but was held to meet only the immediate wants of him to whom it was lent. It became his *property*; he could not, therefore, be obliged to return more than he had received. Father Lehmkuhl goes on to explain those reasons, external to this contract as such, for which the Church allows the capitalist to receive out of his capital a proper interest. Father Pesch subjects to a thorough criticism our "modern theories of State as opposed to the Christian state." Those theories spring up from Kant's philosophy. Kant's system on this topic may be described in the following propositions:—1. Mankind is autonomous, and whatever men do they may do without any respect to God or to the order He has founded. 2. The State is the only origin of every right and may claim an unqualified obedience to its laws. 3. The Church is to be totally severed from the civil society of the State, but notwithstanding this separation her influence on the people is to be kept down, and to be watched over by the Government. 4. The highest degree of perfection to which we can aim is to become good citizens of this world. Father Spillman treats on the arraignment of Father Ogilvie, F. Ehrte on Spellman's well-known work, and F. Meschler on the Jubilee.

4. To the *Literarische Rundschau* I contributed an account of the Bishop of Ossory's "Spicilegium Ossoriense" and the "American Catholic Quarterly Review of 1878."

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Maggio: Firenze. 1879.

Pius IX. and Charles Albert.

THE May numbers of the *Civiltà Cattolica* contain articles of interest entitled "Pio IX. e Carlo Alberto." The occasion is a publication by Signor Nicomede Bianchi (an indefatigable commentator on public and private documents in the interests of Liberalism) of a new work intended to illustrate the memory of Charles Albert, and to claim him as the progenitor of "United Italy," and the patriarch, as it were, of the Revolution which brought it about. It is true that, with the written evidence before him, Bianchi cannot deny the palpable truth that Charles Albert was always and above all a Christian, a Catholic, and a faithful adherent of the Pope and of the Church—incapable, from his ardent faith and strict religious principles, of injuring or offending in any way against the rights, liberty, or

person of the Sovereign Pontiff, for whom he entertained the deepest reverence, and whom he regarded, moreover, as the corner-stone of that greatness which it was his ambition to secure for Italy. Charles Albert was ambitious, but his ambition cannot be regarded as a vulgar one; and Bianchi himself draws attention to the ultimate object which he ever kept in view. "I have no other desire but that of one day winning Paradise," were his own words, and Bianchi candidly quotes passages from his letters, ranging between the ages of twenty-three and forty-two, which prove the nobleness of this monarch's aims. He endeavours, it is true, to attenuate this, his true glory, by alleging, with much complacency, a few facts and documents which he considers to prove that Charles Albert was not a King ready to give ear to the suggestions of priests and monks in affairs appertaining to the competence of lay authority, or one who would forego his rights as Sovereign to surrender to them the free exercise of undue prerogatives. In support of this view—one quite natural to a writer of his class—he has little which is solid to advance, or which goes far to establish it.

Whatever mistakes this monarch may have made, and under whatever illusions he may have laboured as to the means of realising that dream of his life, Italian independence, there is nothing whatsoever to prove, but everything to disprove, that he had any idea of enlarging his own dominions further than by the addition of Lombardo-Venetia, thus substituting the rule of Piedmont in Upper Italy for that of the Austrians. As for entrenching on the rights or of usurping any portion of the dominions of the Holy See, this would have been as repulsive to his conscience as it would have been foreign to his predominant idea. One of the seals he commonly used represented an armed warrior on horseback, with the motto, "Ad majorem Dei gloriam;" the other bore that of the lion clutching a falcon, with the motto, "J'attends mon astre." The star which he expected was, however, certainly not to be identified, as Bianchi would pretend, with that which the anti-Christian and Masonic Revolution has since designated "The Star of Italy," but was the star of the hitherto always Catholic and Papal House of Savoy. Bianchi, in fact, afterwards confesses as much—contradicting himself when he comes to speak of the hopes which the state of things in 1848 awakened in the bosom of Charles Albert; and says that the expected star seemed at last to have dawned and the time to have arrived when his ideal Italy might be realised—an ideal which, even as represented by Signor Bianchi, differed *toto cælo* from that which the Revolution has carried out. Charles Albert's idea was, in fact, a Guelphic Italy. "His fancy," observes Bianchi, "gifted with all that ardour which is to be found in men of the South, and the faith which powerfully ruled his heart, as that of a mediæval crusading knight, made him long for the virile joys of battles, as champion of a Guelphic Italy. Why Guelphic? Because it was as such that reviving Italy was lovingly contemplated by the pious and chivalric King of the House of Savoy."

If, all things considered, Signor Bianchi deals with the character of Charles Albert more impartially than could be expected, as much

cannot be said of his treatment of Pius IX. After stating that he could not succeed in discovering more than three letters between the Pope and Charles Albert—in making which assertion we suppose we must credit him with good faith—he nevertheless proceeds, in the absence of this documentary evidence (which he allows would be desirable to throw light on the years 1847 and 1848), to bring various charges against the venerable Pontiff. He was “greatly deficient in the power of discerning well the true aspect of contemporary facts;” he had “great want of penetration, great inexperience in government;” he was “by nature inclined to vanity, and most ready to allow himself to be unconsciously transported from one thing to another by the breath of popular applause.” To meet these malignant accusations against the immortal Pius IX.—which, however, only discredit him who makes them—the reviewer in the *Civiltà Cattolica* avails himself of the authentic materials laid up during the Pontificate of the late Holy Father, which contain almost the whole of his correspondence with Charles Albert, and furnishes some very interesting extracts which throw a lustre on the memory of Pius IX., and are highly honourable also to the Catholic traditions of the House of Savoy, so well personified in Charles Albert, who, unhappily, was to carry them with him to the grave.

From this correspondence it may be gathered that the fundamental idea of Pius IX.’s policy, in the perilous times which followed his exaltation to the Chair of Peter, was to procure the union of the Italian princes amongst each other with the Holy See for their connecting bond, in order internally to secure peace by resisting the factions which had conspired the ruin of their States, and externally to provide against all provocations to unjust and ambitious wars. England is proved to have shown much favour to the Papal policy at this time and to the projects of reform which it included. Amongst other testimonies to this effect, the reviewer quotes a letter from Mgr. Corboli, the representative of Pius IX. at the Court of Turin, written in the autumn of 1847, mentioning how Lord Minto, having arrived in that city, desired to see him, and how after he had detailed to him the political views of the Holy Father, Lord Minto expressed much admiration for the profound wisdom with which the Pope ruled his own States and of the salutary influence he was exercising throughout Italy, adding that the union of its princes in a wise and moderate progress was fully conformable to the views of England, which saw therein the only means of preserving the peace of the Peninsula.

It is well known how the Revolution defeated the successful issue of Pius IX.’s large-hearted designs; for this failure *he* was not responsible. Charles Albert, notwithstanding his devotion to the Holy See, added to the Pope’s embarrassments by declaring war against Austria. It was an illusion under which he laboured, that by this war he should strengthen his own monarchy, and equally so that the Pope could ever be brought to favour and aid it. Neutrality was a strict obligation of the Holy See; all that Pius IX. could do, since he was powerless to prevent his own subjects from enlisting in the cause,

was to arrange with Charles Albert to take these volunteers under his tutelage, and thus procure them the benefit from which international law would have excluded them had they fought under no banner. It would be difficult to conceive all the anguish which must have wrung the heart of the Father of Christendom at that period. On one side, the triumphant Revolution was urging him to declare war against Austria, and, morally, to head it; on the other, every duty of honour, justice, and holiness forbade such an aggression on a Catholic Power which had given him no cause to attack it. His name was also used by the revolutionary sects against his will, for the manifest advantage which it brought them of lending the war a religious colouring, and this provoked resentment throughout Germany, and caused scandal which he was bound to remove. A malignant interpretation was likewise put on his blessing imparted to Italy, as if it was a solemn sanction given to the war. Finally, the Pontifical troops under the orders of the Piedmontese General, Durando, having without the Holy Father's consent crossed the frontiers to do battle with Austria, it was needful that the common Father of the Faithful should speak out clearly, and make known his true intentions. The letter which he wrote to his envoy at Turin two days before the celebrated Allocution of Peace delivered in the Consistory of the 27th of April, 1848, with a view to its communication to Charles Albert, exhibits his mind so simply, and yet so forcibly, that we cannot do better than quote it. "My position is most difficult, the excited minds here absolutely insist on my pronouncing the word *war*, a thing which I ought not to do. What I think of saying the day after to-morrow to the Cardinals in Consistory is in substance this: That if the reforms granted and the amnesty conceded are the cause of present occurrences, then I am certainly the cause of them. It is true, however, that the five principal Powers gave my predecessor those counsels, which were by me spontaneously put in practice; and so, if in Germany they complain of the Pope and lay the blame of what is happening on him, the Cabinets of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, who proffered the advice, are likewise causes of the present events. I say, the Pope makes war on no one, but at the same time he cannot prevent the ardent desire for Italian nationality from urging the troops of General Durando over the frontiers. Finally, I say that I frankly renounce the seductive projects of the Republicans, who would make of Italy a Republic, with the Pope at its head. I say I renounce these projects, because they would be immensely hurtful to Italy, and because the Holy See has no intention, and never had, to enlarge its temporal dominions, but only the kingdom of Jesus Christ. These are my sentiments, which you may make use of when prudence shall direct. For the rest, in this state of things, I am not cast down; I am not solicitous, I am not alarmed. I place my cause in the hands of God and fully confide in Him."

This letter is a mirror of Pius IX.'s noble, firm, and most religious mind. The army was taken out of his hands and impelled to a war in which the conscience and dignity of the Head of the Church forbade him to participate. He is aware that his refusal to do so, and

the raising of his voice to declare his neutrality as Sovereign, will excite against him the most furious tempest, from which he has no apparent means of escape. He hears the offer made to him by the Revolution of being placed at the head of all the States of Italy, if he will only consent to cover with the august tiara of St. Peter the political unity which it desires to form, and not only does he indignantly reject the wicked proposal, but he denounces it to the world as bad and fatal to Italy. He is pressed on all sides by entreaties, promises, menaces; wild cries resound in his ears, but he stands firm against the surging Revolution, sacrificing to the justice and decorum of the Holy See all the immense popularity he possessed, and placing his confidence in God alone. Such was Pius IX., so lightly charged with weakness and vanity. Had he been weak and vain, had he yielded to the seducing promises of the Revolution of 1848, accepting the offer of "maturing Italy," constituting it *one* under his sceptre, making use of the immense power of his name and authority to restore to it its old, popular, and municipal forms of local government, binding all to himself and to Rome as its centre, who can say whether any one of the dynasties of the Peninsula would ever have regained possession of its dominions? But the supposition is absurd. A Pope can never be the usurper of crowns and thrones. Pius IX. replied with "the great refusal," because before every human interest and earthly ambition he placed conscience, justice, the soul, the Church, and thus gave an example worthy of being had in eternal remembrance, to the confusion of those who, unable to imitate his magnanimity, have the meanness to impute it to him as a disgrace and a crime.

La Scuola Cattolica. 30 Aprile, 1879. Milano.
The Prussian Index.

THE *Scuola Cattolica* of April 30th has an article on the Prussian Index of prohibited books. It begins thus: "Praise be to God! At last they have understood it. The free press is an evil, a mischief, a peril for society. And it is not a *codino*, a bigot, a clerical, a retrogradist, an obscurantist who says so. It is no less than that great Prince, the Prussian Chancellor, who is not content with affirming it, but applies himself to forming an Index of those books which he considers as pernicious to Society; so that even they who scoff at the Roman Index of prohibited books must bow their heads and believe, on the infallibility of the Prussian Chancellor, that these books contain the views which are poisoning society, and which would conduct it to ruin if the Prussian Index had not come in time." The physician in this case is doing the thing thoroughly, for, not contented with proscribing the poisonous ingredients, he is imprisoning the poisoners, closing their pharmacies, dispersing their scientific socialistic meetings; in fine, he is laying his hand to purge society of these iniquitous quacks. There is reason to fear, however, that he has opened his eyes a little too late; that what can no longer be done in public will be done secretly, and that the police, notwithstanding its Argus eyes, will

not have enough to detect all the work of the sects. The reviewer adds that, while not displeased at these measures of the Chancellor, we may be inclined to tell him that he ought to say a *mea culpa* for the liberty he has himself given to the Revolution at home, and the help he has afforded it in other people's houses. He who fans the flame which is burning other men's dwellings may expect to see his own on fire. Liberals are not particular about consistency, and are quite in the habit of being in strong contrast with their theories. Liberty of the press is one of the foremost of these. Well, then, I may speak against the King, against the laws, against the verdict of a jury, the decision of a judge, and what not? No, that is forbidden. Do you not know that a law regulates the liberty of the press? Then it is not free. It is free, and it is not free; a proposition which reconciles itself admirably in the heads of the Liberals who are equal to reconciling a circle and a square. But here is one who altogether gives Liberal theories the lie, severely prohibiting certain books and enacting a new set of laws for the prosecution of the writers and of the promoters of condemned doctrines, and much more of those who, more logical than their masters, would extend liberty of thinking, speaking, and writing, to liberty of acting, as did Hoedel and Nobiling. As for us, says the reviewer, without caring to examine the books in order to ascertain if they were deservedly condemned, we believe it on the Chancellor's word, perhaps more than he himself believes it, and proceed to draw out an apology for the measure.

The question—that is, of the absolute freedom of the press—seems one which common sense might decide, only that this same free press has well-nigh driven common sense out of the world. The writer then proceeds to examine this boasted freedom of man to think, speak, and publish what he wills by the light of first principles. If you do not wish to pass for being demented, you are bound to allow that in the case of abstract and metaphysical truths, liberty of thought is certainly restricted. A man cannot think that two and two make five, or that a circle is not round. In the matter of physical truths he is equally limited by ascertained facts.

Now as to morals: if I were to say that I am free to think that I have a right to appropriate their purses, or to stick a knife into their hearts, would freethinkers be disposed to grant me this liberty? But if thought is not absolutely free, certainly its manifestations, which may prove most injurious to others, cannot be so, and if it be not free to men to speak all that they will, much less can they be free to put it in print, which is not only to fix it, but to disseminate it broad-cast over the whole civilized world. Who could sum up the evils and the mischief produced by a free and licentious press? Governments must by this time know something of its practical results; but to return to the repressive censorship is no slight undertaking for them. It is easier to keep the beast in check when he has the muzzle on, than to replace it if you have had the simplicity to take it off. Governments have had the complaisance to do so, with fatal damage not only to religion and morality, but to their own authority.

It is indeed impossible, says the reviewer, for any Government to hold out long with such a pest in its house. When every rascal is at liberty to censure, without restriction, every law or governmental act, to defame every magistrate, to throw ridicule on the justest measures, to persuade the people that they are ill-governed, that their rights are violated, that they should assert their claims by force should other measures fail of effect, what Government can long make head against such a state of things? The experience of the revolutions of the last century will reply; nor is there the least sign of the closing of their era. Are people satisfied? Far from it. When a revolution has been accomplished which contents one party, its hungry opponents, by the help of the free press, begin to assail the victors for the simple reason that they have themselves no share in the coveted banquet. We may, therefore go to bed to-night as Constitutional Monarchists, without knowing whether to-morrow we may not awake Conservative Republicans or Red Republicans. But is it conceivable that it can be the will of God to abandon society to the caprice, the instability, and the impious cravings of every adventurer who by *fas et nefas* may succeed in disturbing, subverting, and ruining it? Yet all these evils flow from the unshackled liberty, or rather license of the press: that liberty cannot, therefore, be reckoned among the most suitable means for procuring the well-being of society, and this the Prussian Chancellor has understood; who, by prohibiting certain books and journals which assail the most vital principles of all human fellowship, has thus justified the Catholic Church, which, for the protection of religion and morality, and for the interests of society itself, watches over the public press, subjecting it to a censure, and maintaining the Index of prohibited books wisely ordained by the Council of Trent

FRENCH AND BELGIAN PERIODICALS.

Revue Catholique de Louvain. Mars et Avril, 1879.

AN interesting article by M. R. Van Messem, contained in these two numbers, shows that the present Belgian Ministry seeks to annoy the Church on more points than on that of elementary education, and that the spirit which prompts it, however ostentatiously dressed in the garb of politeness, argumentation, and lofty motives, is the same, and leads to the same results, as that which devastated our own once Catholic country with rudeness and force, and for avowedly meaner objects. The article is entitled "Endowments for Masses in Belgium and the Ministerial Circular of 20th September, 1878." A part of the foundations for masses in Belgium date anteriorly to the French Revolution, and have survived through numerous vicissitudes to the present day; a part have been made since the Concordat of 1801 re-established the Catholic religion in its rights. What ought to be the stipend (*honorarium*) of the priest who discharges these obligations? The Minister of Justice, in the Circular named, has undertaken to answer a question which nobody seems to have raised.

Hitherto the priest received whatever honorarium the endowment

gave him, and no Government thought of interfering. Now, M. Bara has drawn a distinction which is not only unjust but oppressive to the clergy, hurtful by consequence to the poor, and prejudicial to works of charity. Indeed, the true motive of the Circular is exactly to compass these ends. Some of these endowments, says the Minister, are made in favour of the priest; some are in favour of the church (*fabrique*), with the obligation of masses attached. In the first case, as it is a personal revenue, the priest is to have what has been bequeathed to him, minus only the revenue tax; in the last case he is to receive only what is the fixed stipend of the diocese. Donations left for masses can only be legally paid at the rate of the diocesan tariff. And the Circular has already been put into action, to the detriment of the clergy concerned.

The writer of the article takes occasion before discussing the motives and the equity of this Ministerial intervention to give a learned and interesting sketch of the origin and history of the *honorarium* and the rules which govern it in Canon law.

The Church has never had payments for masses, as though the mass could be rated at a *price*. But from St. Paul's day onwards, the *honorarium*, or its equivalent, has existed, and for the Apostle's reason: the minister of the altar should live by the altar (1 Cor. ix. 13). At the beginning, it was the offertory; and the offertory was exclusively bread and wine, of which a sufficient part was used in the sacrifice, and the remainder taken for the support of the ministers. Later the offerings were of all kinds, including money. Authors are not agreed when precisely the *honorarium* in our modern acceptation began—viz., an offering to the priest, in return for which the donor has the fruits of the sacrifice for his special intention; some say it is not anterior to the eighth century; others, that it is much earlier. Certainly, from the eighth century the practice was universal. Bishops, popes, and councils took much pains that the custom should not degenerate into an abuse. Finally, Honorius III. restricted each priest to one mass daily for this object. And the Council of Trent, in its twenty-second Session, put forth detailed and strict regulations for the same end.

The diocesan tariff is not an absolute rule. A priest asked to offer the holy sacrifice may do so freely, if the request come from the poor; he may accept a larger gift if the demand come from the rich. The diocesan tariff is a fixed sum beyond which he has no right to ask anything from those who would secure his masses. It varies, too, with times and places; it is the ordinance of the bishop; the bishop alone has the right to alter it; though the Civil Government may ask that the tariff be submitted to its approbation.

When the Church or a priest accepts endowments or offerings for masses, a contract is formed between the two sides; one asks a favour and makes an offering, the other accepts the conditions and engages to fulfill them carefully. It implies on the part of the priest an obligation of justice, and a long list of ecclesiastical laws and censures regulate the exact fulfilment of the obligation and the prevention of abuses. Pius IX. fulminates excommunication, reserved to the

Sovereign Pontiff, and to be incurred, *ipso facto*, by priests who dare to gather rich intentions and have their masses celebrated in other places where the tariff is lower. Yet M. Bara does not hesitate to accuse the clergy of doing a lucrative trade in mass-offerings, and hints that Rome does not distinctly forbid it.

The author then gives a brief history of the Catholic custom of bequeathing alms or foundations for the purpose of securing masses for the *deceased* donor. In the very first ages of the Church, and before the present usage of *honorarium*, the faithful, believing in the efficacy of the sacrifice beyond the grave, made offerings even of goods and lands for securing a share in the sacrificial prayers; their names were inscribed on the sacred diptychs. In many churches there was the custom of placing this list before the eyes of the celebrant as he offered mass.

A sketch is next given of the effects of the French Revolution on religion in Belgium, to show that these endowments were spared during even that ordeal, if not altogether from a sentiment of reverence for the wishes of the dead, from a conviction of the equity of the contract between the donor and the priest. "It has been reserved for M. Bara to break with all these administrative traditions, and thus to inaugurate a system of legal persecution against the Catholic clergy, whose salutary influence he desires to diminish at any cost." The arguments of the Minister are then dealt with in detail. In conclusion comes a paragraph which will probably surprise all for the manifest injustice it reveals. "Another question raised by the Circular is: When bequests are made for the support of the clergy, is the amount of revenue thus accruing to them to be deducted from the stipend paid them by the State?" M. Bara says *it is*. "Such a legacy," he says, "has no other effect than to relieve the public treasury of the whole or a part of its obligation towards the legatee priest."

The State salary to the clergy is the payment of a real debt of justice—a compensation for the goods and possessions unjustly taken from them in 1789. The legislator of 1789 himself acknowledged this; in the Decree which placed ecclesiastical possessions at the disposal of the nation, he expressly declared that it was "at the price of providing, in a becoming manner, the expenses of worship, the support of churches, and the relief of the poor." Mirabeau said to the National Assembly that there was no more sacred debt than this. The Concordat of 1801 stipulated the same obligation in return for the ratification granted by the Pope of the sale of Church property. All Governments since, in Belgium as in France, have regarded the endowment of the clergy as a public debt. And at the National Congress Art. 117 of the Constitution was voted in this sense. What revolution has spared, a ministry of "progress" threatens to seize!

There are articles on the educational crisis in Belgium in the *Revue Catholique de Louvain*, for March and April, by M. C. Pieraert; in the *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit* (Paris), for April, by M. Robinet de Cléry, and by M. Daniel Touzaud. It will be sufficient thus to indicate them to those who may be desirous of reading on

the subject in detail. The purport of the proposed law, and its bearing on Catholic interests and prospects in Belgium, are clearly set forth in Professor Lamy's article in our present number.

Revue Générale. Juin, 1879. Bruxelles.

"**L**A Philosophie Naturelle en Angleterre," an article by Professor Provost, of the University of Louvain, contains a sketch in appreciation of Herbert Spencer's system of philosophy. "The learned English economist has brought to the study of social, metaphysical, and psychological problems the acuteness of observation, inexhaustible imagination and spirit of patient analysis which characterise the physical philosophers beyond the Channel, and which is the reason of the popularity which Darwinism just now enjoys." But the writer justly blames indiscriminate admiration for the work of Spencer. "People forget that it is not enough that a theory be new and original in order to be true, and that if it succeeds in uniting together all facts—material, biological, psychological, and social in its synthesis, that may be because, perhaps, it defeats criticism by the vague and abstract phraseology in which it is artistically clothed." Such is the case with Spencer's philosophy, spite of his rare powers of observation, induction, analysis, and even of synthesis. One thing cannot be denied him, whether he be rightly or wrongly the head of the modern positivist school—viz., his immense erudition. He founds his doctrine of progress by Evolution on the chemistry of Lavoisier and the principles of modern mechanics, especially of thermodynamics, to which we owe the discovery of the "conservation of energy." By the light of this discovery other *savants*, among them Father Secchi, had already explained the genesis, evolution, and conservation of worlds, as also the physico-chemical phenomena which preceded organization on the earth. The best explanation of vital action by thermodynamics was given by Father Carbonelle, a Jesuit, in the *Etudes* of Paris, long before the works of Spencer were popular in France. A long but clear analysis is then given of Spencer's system, commencing with its "point of departure from the indestructibility of matter and of energy, the two grand acquisitions of modern chemistry and physics." "It cannot be denied," says the writer, "that, even in a perfect state, there is anatomically and physiologically less difference between a man and a monkey than there is between a monkey and a reptile or bird. The human body is a machine formed of the same materials and subject to the same forces and laws as those of animals. Within these limits the question of the origin of bodies is reduced to small importance; whether the body of man descends from a pre-existing organism or does not, none the less is his body that of an animal. . . . This is important, because false notions, especially of anatomy, still lead many spiritualist philosophers to isolate the human organism in creation, and to reject with horror the hypothesis of the animal origin of man. The hypothesis is, in truth, far from being proved, although learned Catholics are not opposed to accepting it, and pulpit orators, such as Père Monsabré,

are disposed to admit the existence of a precursor of man in the ancient and new world, in order to explain the discovery of the numerous traces of human industry in pre-historic times. It should be remarked, too, that Darwin has never taught that man descends from the monkey, but from an animal stock, from which monkeys may well have been a departure, since they are so near man in organization. There is really a confusion between community of *origin* and a community of *nature*. But the former exists from a *physical point of view*. This fact, however, trenches on no religious teaching; we are nowhere told that God made *the body* of man to His own image and likeness."

Revue des Questions Historiques. Avril, 1879. Paris. "*Étude sur Jérôme Savonarole des Frères Prêcheurs*." Par le R. P. E.-C. Bayonne, du même ordre. Paris: Poussielgue, 1879.

"UNE nouvelle étude sur Savonarola," by M. Henri de l'Épinois, gives a résumé of this recently published book. It is related that Pius VII. said, "In heaven I shall have a solution of this question of Savonarola." The solution has not failed for want of workers. Multitudes of books, by names of worth, have alternately handled and blackened the memory of the Dominican Friar. This latest volume, by the Père Bayonne, has this merit, that it rests on documents for the most part unpublished, or at least only recently brought to light, which throw light on more than one point hitherto obscure. Was Savonarola an impostor, or was he sincere and enlightened? Was he a proud and disobedient monk? Authors have thought all these things of him; Père Bayonne thinks he was an extraordinary man, raised by Divine goodness to fill the rôle of the ancient prophets. "The case is not yet settled: but assuredly the facts here related by the new historian with more precision and more exactness than by his predecessors and the evidences collected by him are too important not to merit notice, and will give food for reflection to those who still hesitate and doubt." The testimony in favour of Savonarola's holiness made by St. Francis of Paula, though rejected by Papebrock as resting on an unauthentic letter, is here accepted, since the arguments against it have been vigorously refuted by Mgr. Perrimezzi, Consultor of the *Index*. The most critical point in the history of the Florentine religious is his relation with Alexander VI. This point has been carefully examined by the author. The Briefs for the excommunication of Savonarola cannot be denied; neither can the accusations launched against this "son of iniquity" for teaching perverse dogma. But all that they clearly show is the manner in which the Pope was circumvented and deceived. The legate was gained over by the Arrabiati and the Tepidi, to represent that Savonarola's preaching was hostile to the Pope and dangerous to Italy. After calling him to Rome on the 20th July, 1495, and suspending him from preaching, by a letter dated 20th of September, and by another of the 16th of October, the Pope, through the Procurator-General of the Order, made an offer to Savonarola of the Cardinalate, if he would cease announcing future

events. His offer was refused, and the Pope, admiring the refusal, said, "This man must be a great servant of God," and wished thenceforth to hear no more said about him. But the Preacher had enemies both in and outside his Order, and his excommunication of the 13th May was solicited by other religious, and perhaps paid for in money—if reliance can be placed on a manuscript life of him kept at St. Mark's. Savonarola declared he was falsely accused by his enemies, and besought the Pope not to listen to malice but carefully to inform himself in the matter. He denied the validity of the excommunication, said the Pope had been deceived, and was sincere, perhaps, in affirming that he would have acted contrary to charity if he had submitted to it. Alexander VI. himself, late in life, rejected the decisions made at the instance of cruelty and passion, and many Popes seem to have had a persuasion of Savonarola's innocence and unjust condemnation.

Notices of Books.

Galileo Galilei and the Roman Curia. By KARL VON GEBLER. Translated by Mrs. G. STURGE. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* of May 14th, in a strongly anti-Catholic review of the above work, thus characterizes its literary merits. We appropriate the passage, because we are disposed entirely to concur with it, and it is not worth while to take trouble in expressing afresh what has already been expressed:—

"The late Herr von Gebler's monograph," says the *Pall Mall* critic, "is by far the best of the numerous works that have appeared on the subject. Its calm weighing of facts, and the calm research by which these facts have been ascertained, are the more remarkable, as the author was not an experienced historian, but a cavalry officer, who died at the age of twenty-eight, shortly after the completion of his work. The genesis of that work is worthy of notice. One of the author's earliest literary efforts was a critical study of so-called 'Historic Sayings;' among which 'E pur si muove' naturally occupied a prominent place. This brought him into close acquaintance with Galileo's life, and especially with his trial by the Inquisition; and the result was the first edition of the present work (in 1875), which created a sensation in Germany, and still more in Italy. So far the author had resorted for the most part to generally accessible sources, such as the well-known publication by De l'Épinois of part of the Vatican MS. relating to the trial, and other works. But when, in 1876, Dominico Berti, who also had examined the Acts in the Vatican, taunted the German scholars with their ignorance of the original documents, Gebler at once resolved to remedy the defect; and, in spite of his failing health, went to Rome, where for ten weeks, during the oppressive heat of the summer of 1877, he spent fourteen hours a day in the Papal Archives, studying and copying the Acts of Galileo's trial. The first result of this absorbing and, in large measure,

suicidal labour was the frank acknowledgment of an error. Gebler, like other German scholars, had found reason to believe that the celebrated document, dated February 26th, 1616, which played so important a part in Galileo's trial, was a late fabrication. Now he found himself obliged to withdraw this opinion, and acknowledge its authenticity."*

Now, in regard to those matters of detail in which Gebler may be at variance with his Catholic opponents—we have no wish whatever to examine, in what cases he is right and in what wrong. In fact, the present writer has no critical power enabling him to elucidate such questions. But we do say confidently, that no Catholic controversialist need be unwilling to accept all the facts, precisely as Gebler states them; that the facts, as exhibited by him, are disgraceful to Galileo, and honourable whether to the Pope or to the other officials of the Church. The present writer, on three earlier occasions (October, 1865; April, 1871; July, 1871), treated in this REVIEW the controversial bearings of this Galileo question; and there is nothing we should like better, than that any reader, who may do us the honour of bearing in mind what we there urged, would proceed to test the accuracy of our statements of fact by a study of Gebler's narrative. Within the limits of a notice, we can, of course, refer only to one or two salient points.

The most important fact of all to a Catholic, we need hardly say, is that there is no pretext for alleging, that Copernicanism was ever condemned *ex cathedrâ*. Gebler himself, on two occasions (pp. 169, note; 236, note), points this out. He also quotes the express dicta uttered by Catholics of the period—Riccioli, Caramuel, Gassendi, Descartes—to the same effect; Riccioli and Caramuel being themselves intensely anti-Copernican.

Secondly, we have always urged that the Popes of that period would have grievously failed in their duty had they not done the utmost in their power, short of an *ex cathedrâ* definition, to repress Copernicanism. Since last we treated this theme, Cardinal Newman has expressed himself on the subject; and we cannot do better than quote part of what he says:—

Galileo might be right in his conclusion that the earth moves; to consider him a heretic might have been wrong; but there was nothing wrong in censuring abrupt, startling, unsettling, unverified disclosures, if such they were—disclosures at once uncalled-for and inopportune, at a time when the limits of revealed truth had not as yet been ascertained. A man ought to be very sure of what he was saying before he risked the chance of contradicting the Word of God. . . . Galileo's truth is said to have startled and scared the Italy of his day. It revolutionized the received system of belief as regards heaven, purgatory, hell, to say that the earth went round the sun; and it forcibly imposed upon categorical statements of Scripture a figurative interpretation. Heaven was no longer above, nor earth below;† the heavens no longer literally opened and shut; purgatory and hell were not for certain under the earth. . . .

* The *Pall Mall* writer adds, "In the sense to be defined presently." These words refer to a point which we shall ourselves have to mention.

† See this point urged by ourselves in July, 1871, pp. 157-8.

Whither did our Lord go on His Ascension? If there be a plurality of worlds, what is the special importance of this one? And is the whole visible Universe, with its infinite spaces, one day to pass away? We are used to these questions now, and reconciled to them; and on that account are no fit judges of the disorder and dismay which the Galilean hypothesis would cause to good Catholics as soon as they became cognisant of it, and how necessary it was in charity to delay the formal reception of a new interpretation of Scripture, till their imaginations should gradually get accustomed to it."—"Via Media," vol. i. pp. lv., lvi.

Cardinal Newman's immediate point here is the true and important one, that, even if the Copernican theory had been at that time cognisable as true, it was nevertheless the Church's bounden duty to keep back (as far as possible) from the knowledge of Catholics the fact of that theory having been established, "till their imaginations should gradually get accustomed to it." The thesis on which we ourselves laid stress was (as we may say) antecedent to this. We entirely denied, that the Copernican theory *was* at that time cognisable as true. In fact, even as regards the scientific argument taken *exclusively*, Galileo's alleged discovery was hardly more than what is vulgarly called a "fluke."* On the one hand, the argument on which he laid more stress than on all others put together—viz., that based on the *tides*—is now universally admitted to be utterly worthless. On the other hand, the physical objections to the theory were so serious, as to be entirely incapable of removal in the then existing state of science. Gebler refers to both these facts (pp. 127, 244); at the same time, naturally enough, he does not lay that stress upon them which is surely their due.

This being so, the thesis we have throughout advocated has been this: Nothing less than full scientific proof of some new physical theory can justify Christians in interpreting Scripture, otherwise than according to its one traditional and one obvious sense. But as soon as such scientific proof is forthcoming, the relevant passages of Scripture may legitimately receive a figurative interpretation. Moreover, we have alleged that this was throughout the recognised principle of Galileo's theological opponents. Gebler quite bears out this latter statement. Thus, in the early part of Galileo's career, Cardinal Conti, "who was very friendly to him," said to him that the figurative method of interpreting Scripture is "to be employed only in case of the greatest necessity" (p. 41). And Father Grassi (who, with Bellarmine, was perhaps his most earnest theological opponent) said that, "when the truth of these opinions was unanswerably established, the theologians would bestir themselves to alter the interpretation of those passages of Scripture which refer to the earth as being stationary" (p. 121). We quoted other theological testimonies to the same effect, in July, 1871, pp. 162-3.

Against this thesis of ours, two objections have been made, to mention no others. Firstly, it has been alleged that the Church did not proceed on the principle which we maintain; for that she fully tolerated Copernicus's work at a much earlier period. Gebler points

* See July, 1871, pp. 159-161.

out (pp. 14, 15) that the case was quite otherwise. In Osiander's Preface to Copernicus's work, it was distinctly stated that Heliocentrism was not otherwise therein advocated than as "a hypothesis which need not be considered even probable, as it was only intended to facilitate astronomical calculations." And, though a few other writers (p. 38) had (before Galileo) speculatively advocated Heliocentrism, yet their advocacy had had no kind of practical influence, and was therefore very reasonably ignored by the authorities. The case was fundamentally different when Galileo began to gather round him an influential school of thought.

Secondly, it has been alleged, with a similar purpose, that Urban VIII., when Cardinal, had been favourable to Galileo's tenets; and that he would never, as Pope, have proceeded against that offender had not his vanity been wounded by the circumstance of Galileo holding him up to ridicule under the name of Simplicius. Gebler, in the course of his work, denies every successive detail of this allegation. (See pp. 62, 110, 134, &c. &c.) It is simply impossible, he says (p. 160), that Urban VIII. could have considered himself intended by Galileo under the name of Simplicius. And Gebler sets forth (p. 162) what he considers to have been the Pope's true motives in instituting the Galileo process. At the same time, Gebler thinks (but we can ourselves see no ground whatever for the supposition) that personal reasons of a different kind did occupy a place, though but a subordinate one, in moving the Pope to action.

One fact, which told strongly against Galileo in his trial of 1633, was that in 1616 he had been commanded—not merely to abstain from advocating Copernicanism otherwise than as a mere scientific hypothesis—but to abstain from treating it in any way whatever. The official document stating this will be found in p. 77. It is dated February 26th. Now, whether or no it were true, in 1633, that Galileo had violated the injunction of 1616, by treating Copernicanism otherwise than as a hypothesis—nothing can be more certain than that he had violated that injunction by treating the subject *at all*. Galileo, therefore, was driven to allege that he had entirely forgotten that particular part of the precept imposed on him; and Gebler himself, in his first edition, maintained that, at all events, the alleged document of February 26th was *spurious*. This was the opinion which Gebler retracted in 1877, after his laborious examination of the Vatican MS. But, even before he had instituted that examination, we are a little surprised that Gebler can have acquiesced in such a view. He never doubted the authenticity of the document of February 26th (printed in p. 77), which records the Pope's instruction that the precept in question *shall* be imposed on Galileo; and this makes his original rejection of the *other* document less intelligible. But it would require several pages, even to touch on the various matters suggested by this little controversy.

We argued, in April, 1871 (p. 363), that the command imposed on Galileo, of *interior assent* to the Decree of 1616, was most reasonable, apart from any supposition of its having been issued *ex cathedrâ*. The whole course of Gebler's narrative corroborates (to our mind) the ground

on which we based that statement. We find also (p. 236, note) that Gassendi—while expressly denying the *ex cathedrâ* character of the Decree—nevertheless “recognised its high authority,” and “subjected to it his personal opinions.”

We said, in April, 1871 (p. 366), that Galileo acted throughout as a man “who was restrained by no sense of truth, of loyalty, of honour.” We think that the whole of Gebler’s volume emphatically bears out this statement. All who have studied Galileo’s letters are unanimous (we believe) in holding that, from first to last, he entirely embraced the Copernican theory. This being so, it follows that his whole dealings with ecclesiastical authority made up one consistent piece of organized hypocrisy. (See pp. 66, 94, 99, 100.) In 1630 he described the Decree of 1616 as “a salutary Edict” (p. 129). In 1633 he declared *on oath* that he had “regarded” the Copernican arguments “as inconclusive;” and had (in his inculpated work) “intended to refute them” (p. 215). At the same period he promised with an oath that he would denounce to the Inquisition every advocate of Copernicanism he should meet with.* On the other hand (p. 280), “he did not hesitate to act in opposition to his solemn oath, literally construed,† by secretly sending a copy of his condemned and prohibited ‘Dialogues’ to Diodati at Paris, that they might be translated into Latin, and thus more widely circulated.” How were the authorities to deal with such an offender?

We should think that so odious and despicable a character as Galileo can very seldom have appeared on the public stage; and we think that successive Popes dealt with him far too mercifully. During his trial of 1633, says Gebler (p. 210), “as far as his material situation was concerned, nothing but *favours unheard of in the annals of the Inquisition* were shown him.”‡ W. G. WARD.

[Since the preceding notice was sent to press, another strongly anti-Catholic writer has pronounced a warm eulogy of Gebler’s work, in the *Examiner* of June 7th. This writer says that “the leading points” of the Galileo case, as regards matters of fact, “may” now “be regarded as finally set at rest.” If such a statement of facts as Gebler’s be really accepted by non-Catholics, Catholic controversy on the subject will have made a most important step forward.]

Essays from the DUBLIN REVIEW. By W. G. WARD, D.Ph.
London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

THESE Essays, the publication of which in a separate form will give great pleasure to Dr. Ward’s numerous admirers, are ten in number. They are mainly occupied with the controversy raised by

* Such, at least, is Gebler’s interpretation (p. 247) of Galileo’s promissory oath; and we should say plainly the true interpretation.

† We should like to have asked Gebler how Galileo’s oath could have been “non-literally construed.”

‡ Gebler adds, indeed, that “nothing was left undone to find the best method of effecting his moral ruin.” But this is a matter rather of opinion than of fact; and we cannot even conjecture what Gebler means by such an opinion.

Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* in reference to the prerogatives and worship of the Blessed Virgin. Two hundred pages of the volume before us are taken up with an exposition, in Dr. Ward's well-known earnest and logical fashion, of the great principle which is at the bottom of Catholic devotion to our Lady—viz., that, as Jesus is the way to the Father, so is Mary the way to Jesus. He says, in the interesting preface which he has prefixed to this re-publication:—

There are certain particulars in Catholic devotion to the Most Holy Virgin, which, at the time of my conversion, were felt by me as difficulties; though I accepted them (as was surely most reasonable) on faith. At a very early period, however, of my Catholic life, what appeared (and appears) to me the true rationale of those particulars, presented itself to my mind. I heard it said by Catholics on all sides of me that Mary is the way to Jesus, as Jesus is the way to the Father. Let this statement be taken—not as a vague generalization or rhetorical exaggeration—but as the literal truth, and then the whole matter (I came more and more to think) is clear enough. I came more and more to hold that Catholic devotion to our Blessed Lady, even in the extremest shape which it wears among authorized and approved writers, does but legitimately develop the dogma of the Incarnation. I came, indeed, more and more to hold that any lower and less prominent devotion to her implies a deficient apprehension of that central Christian dogma, as regards its reasonable practical results. And, conversely, I came more and more to hold that the objections commonly brought against the Catholic cultus of Mary—if they had any relevance at all—would be equally, nay, in a still greater degree, relevant against the Christian worship of Jesus (pp. viii, ix).

The first Essay, which is very long, covering some hundred pages, travels over a large number of the points usually made by Anglicans against Catholic devotion to Mary. Many of our readers will probably remember its appearance some thirteen years ago. Leaving the patristic and scriptural difficulties for separate treatment, this exhaustive article treats the doctrinal objections of Dr. Pusey; and Dr. Ward certainly grapples with his opponent in the very closest argumentative battle. Dr. Pusey—and although the *Eirenicon* is an old book now, still every priest knows that numerous Anglicans yet hold similar views—says that it is true Catholics do not worship our Lady with divine honour, but they practically “go to” her instead of going to Jesus in order to be saved. They spend much time in praying to her—time which might have been given to Jesus; and their feelings are so enlisted in her worship, that practically they prefer to pray to her rather than to pray to our Lord. “The human mind is narrow, and easily filled with one thought,” says Dr. Pusey; “it seems inconceivable that many should not *stop short* in her.” Dr. Ward accepts this objection, and analyzes it; but first he takes it and intensifies it (p. 15). “Prayer to *her*,” he makes his opponent say, “will issue freely and warmly from the heart, while addresses to God will be little more than the perfunctory and external performance of a certain stated and prescribed routine.” Dr. Ward's line of answer—carried out with the greatest skill and in ample detail—is to admit the facts and deny the consequence. He admits that ordinary Catholics pray a good deal to the Blessed Virgin, and so omit to pray, during that time,

directly to our Lord ; he admits that they often go to her with greater attraction (in the lower faculties) than to Jesus Christ ; and he grants that their *sensible* devotion to Jesus is sometimes, and in some cases, less than their sensible devotion to Mary.

But he maintains that all this, instead of lessening their solid devotion and substantial love of God, increases it. In fact, devotion to Mary almost invariably causes an increase of the time given to direct prayer to Jesus. Then, knowledge and love towards God may be at certain times far more effectively promoted by prayer to Mary than by direct prayer to God and Christ. Dr. Pusey admits that, with ordinarily pious men, it often requires less effort and exertion to fix their thoughts on a created person, such as Mary, than on God Incarnate. On such occasions, therefore, their prayer to her will be "far more earnest, far less distracted, far more heartfelt," than if addressed directly to God. Again, devotion to our Lady, if constant and unremitting, will lead men to a loving contemplation of her history ; of those "mysteries," joyful, sorrowful, and glorious, which are commemorated in the Rosary. But to dwell on her mysteries is to think of Him, in the most affecting and impressive way possible. Besides, "sensible" devotion is not opposed to "solid" piety. Most men cannot, on the whole, and in the long run, be *solidly* devout without a considerable share of *sensible* devotion. But sensible devotion, though keener and more vivid when its object is Jesus, is often more readily and immediately excited towards Mary.

In one word, then. Those Christians, of whom we are now speaking, are in general very far more easily diverted from worldly to heavenly thoughts, and very far more rapidly raised into sensible devotion, by the contemplation of Mary than in any other way. But sensible devotion (see pp. 22, 33) is of inappreciable value in promoting solid piety ; and the contemplation of Mary, by its own nature, carries men forward out of itself into contemplation of Jesus and of God. Mary, therefore, is the way to Jesus, just as Jesus is the way to the Father (p. 45).

The "Protestant difficulty" that lies at the bottom of all this is really the utterly inadequate idea which nearly all Protestants have of the divinity of our Blessed Lord. They object to our making Mary equal to Jesus, because their only idea of Jesus is that of a glorified or privileged *man*. "Few Protestants," says Cardinal Newman, "have any real perception of the doctrine of God and man in one Person."

Besides this first Essay, there are others of great value on various parts of the great Marian question. But it seems to us that the great fundamental position, that, devotionally, Mary is the *way* (speaking of mankind generally) to Jesus, has never been more philosophically treated than by Dr. Ward in these pages. It is a view of the utmost importance, and we should be glad to see the attention of Catholic theologians and philosophers turned to it with greater care. Its consideration will be found to involve the very essential elements of all worship and all devotion.

The other Essays relate to St. Paul's "opposition" to St. Peter, to

St. Mary Magdalene, to F. Coleridge's labours in the Gospel history, and to the narrative of the Resurrection. On all these questions Dr. Ward, as we need not assure our readers, has something acute and original to say.

Of the Love of God. Translated from the original French of Saint Francis de Sales. (Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics). London: Rivingtons, 1878.

CONSIDERING that "English Catholics" are Protestants, we are astonished as well as pleased that this translation is so faithful and complete. Even Chapter 13 of Book viii., where "obedience to the Church" is laid down as the third of the tests that our inspirations come from God, is neither abridged nor otherwise "adapted." Can any English Catholic fail to remember what Church Saint Francis emphatically meant? Again, Chapter 8 of the same book is headed, "Contempt for the evangelic counsels is a great sin," and is given entire. We rejoice that "English" Catholics should think so, or here learn to think so: we cannot but add, however, that it should send them to their Litany petition, "Remember not, Lord, the offences of our forefathers."

We have grown used to finding our Blessed Lady's highest titles and praises in their manuals; we are, therefore, less surprised to see here the Saint's sweet and glowing eulogies of his glorious mother faithfully transcribed.

The translator has aimed at giving the sense rather than a literal rendering of the quaint and prolix French, so that in not a few places two or more sentences of the original are represented by one of the translation. The result is a book that reads easily and presents us with the Saint's thoughts in pleasing language. The translator may be congratulated on his singular success. There are a few, very few, places where we think we detect a suspicious softening of important expressions. For example, we read (p. 244), "A certain nobleman went to Palestine to visit the Holy Places, and *after due confession and communion* he reached Nazareth," &c. St. Francis says, "Et pour commencer dignement ce saint exercice, avant toutes choses il se confessa et communia dévotement." Even this, however, may have been done in good faith.

In his preface St. Francis digresses to tell how several villages near Geneva were brought back from Protestantism, "heresy," as the Saint says, partly by his labours, &c. All this is omitted, and in brackets we learn ["here follow some other unimportant details"]. The details are not necessary, indeed, but the translator's adjective would have pained St. Francis. Still more so would the translator's omission of the last paragraph of the preface, for which no bracketed excuse appears. We recommend this omitted conclusion to the special notice of "English Catholics." "I submit with all my heart, my writings, words, and actions to the correction of the Holy Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, knowing that she is the pillar and the ground of truth,"

which can neither deceive nor be deceived, and that no one can have God for his father who has not *this* Church for his mother. Annecy, the feast of the loving Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, 1616. Dieu soit beni!"

The texts in the volume are, of course, in the language of the Protestant version, and are thus less pleasing, if not annoying, to a Catholic reader; but, with this exception, its fidelity to the original and the beauty of language make it a book which we can recommend to all.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Vol. IV.
By HENRY FOLEY. London: Burns and Oates, 1878.

A VOLUME of 743 pages, well printed, carefully edited, illustrated with photographs and genealogies, containing a more or less elaborate account of over one hundred and fifty Jesuit fathers and others who laboured and suffered in the English mission during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—this description by no means exhausting the merits of Brother Foley's fourth volume. Those who have already made acquaintance with the first three will know that they may expect, in the one now before us, that interesting reference to originals, that painstaking accuracy, and that unwearying effort after completeness which constitute the charm of a book of records. The fourth volume travels over five of the "Colleges" or districts into which the Society had divided England for the purposes of administration—viz., those of Worcester, of South Wales (with Herefordshire and Monmouthshire), of North Wales, of Oxfordshire, and of Devonshire. Nothing could possibly be more interesting to a Catholic than the elaborate lives of Father Henry Garnett, Father Edward Oldcorne, and Brother Thomas Owen, and their connection with Hinlip Castle, near Worcester. Father Henry Garnett is, with the exception of Father Parsons and Father Campion, the best known name of all the Jesuit martyrs. A man of steady purpose, great governing power and infinite resource, he ruled and directed the Society in England for many years, passing through numerous deadly perils, and doing good everywhere, until, in the fever of the Powder Plot, he and Father Oldcorne were seized at Hinlip. With them, at Hinlip, was taken Brother Nicholas Owen, a man who had constructed or altered half the Catholic houses in the West Midlands, having "schemed," as Cecil said, "an innumerable quantity of dark holes for hiding priests all through England." A good third of the volume is taken up with the setting forth of the original documents and materials for a history of these three heroes. The circumstances connected with the search and capture at Hinlip are singularly full and minute; we seem to be under the very roof and to hear and to see, rather than to read, the whole story of the life of the great Catholic house, of the terrible danger all around, of the search, with its brutality, of the vicissitudes of the searchers and the hidden victims, and of the final discovery. Hinlip deserves a monograph to itself. Indeed, the publication of these records will throw a glamour of holy romance over many a spot where old Catholic houses

stood, where priests prayed and hid, where the people flocked for mass and sacraments, and where at last the armed officers seized perhaps both priest and host, and the gentle wife and children were left to mourn, and the people gradually, alas! to desert a faith whose knowledge they had no means of keeping up.

Sermons for all Sundays and Festivals of the Year. By J. N. SWEENEY, D.D., O.S.B. Second edition. London: Burns and Oates, 1879.

THE fact that a second edition of these useful and thoughtful Sermons has been called for is sufficient proof that they are appreciated. A sermon written with learning and care, in easy and attractive language, is one of the best possible instruments of spiritual culture. Pious people, who may be somewhat careless about religious knowledge, read it because it is a sermon, and learn something without meaning it; more cultured readers, wanting spiritual reading, yet impatient of mere pious talk, are glad to meet with food for thought and memory. Abbot Sweeney's Sermons are devout, instructive, and pleasant to read.

Introductio in Sacram Scripturam ad usum Scholarum Pont. Seminarii Romani et Collegii Urbani, auctore Ubaldo Ubaldi, Presbytero Romano, SS. Literarum Prof. Vols. I. et II. Romæ, ex Typographiad, Polyglottâ S. C. de Propaganda Fide. 1877 and 1879.

THIS work promises to be one of the most complete text-books on the Sacred Scripture ever written. The author modestly calls it an Introduction intended simply for beginners. But it is really a most thorough and exhaustive treatise on all important scriptural questions. The position of the author, as Professor of Sacred Scripture in the Pontifical Seminary, gives it also an extrinsic authority. Still there is none of the professorial *ipse dixit* in the treatment of vexed questions. Difficulties are fairly and fully stated, and answered in the fullest and kindest manner. Nor is there any disposition to bend facts to theories, as is very manifest in the author's treatment of the questions relating to the closing of the Jewish Canon. It can hardly be said that a new text-book on the Sacred Scripture is uncalled for, in these days when new defences are needed to meet fresh points of attack. The learned Professor seems to be as deeply versed in modern Biblical literature as he is in that of earlier times. Judging from the number of English books cited, Professor Ubaldi must be a complete master of English. It is surprising, however, that he has overlooked Dr. Pusey's defence of Daniel and the writers in the "Speaker's Commentary." The discoveries of Egyptologists and Assyriologists are generally turned to good account; but we were disappointed to find that the Professor had not adopted Rawlinson's identification of Daniel's Baltassar with Bil-shar-uzur, the newly-discovered son of Nabonadius. In defending the Pentateuch, the

learned Professor is not afraid to give battle to Evolutionists and Geologists on their own ground. But we do not know what the latter will say to his claiming their ice-boulders and mountain-shells as proofs of the universality of the Deluge.

The difficult subject of inspiration seems to us to be very ably treated. In an historical survey of opinions held on this matter, our author shows how Protestantism, which started with the most rigid theory of more than verbal inspiration, has ended in countenancing views scarcely consistent with the notion of any inspiration whatever. He quotes the ruling of the Privy Council in the *Essays and Reviews* judgment—"that it is not a contradiction to the law of the Church to affirm that any part of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, however unconnected with religious faith or moral duties, was not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." The Louvain controversy about the three propositions of Lessius is very fully narrated, and it is shown how the decree of the Vatican Council has made the view, that subsequent approval was tantamount to inspiration, untenable. The Professor insists strongly on the distinction between inspiration and revelation. By inspiration he understands the actual and supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit on the intellect and will of the sacred writer, whereby he writes those things, and those things only, which God wills, though he may have learnt them from human sources. This Divine inspiration, he teaches, extends to the whole of the Sacred Scripture, and all its parts; but whilst the substance, the ideas, and subject-matter are from the Holy Spirit, the words, the form of expression and the style are left to the choice and individuality of the writer. This is quite in agreement with the old Jewish doctrine which taught that the law spoke the Word of God, but with the tongues of men.

The history of the Vulgate version is very fully told, with all St. Jerome's struggles and disappointments. The true meaning of the Tridentine Decree about its authenticity is clearly explained. The Fathers did not intend that the Vulgate should supersede the older Eastern versions, much less the originals; nor did they declare it absolutely perfect or faultless. Its authenticity is to be understood relatively not absolutely; the Vulgate, in preference to all other Latin versions, is declared to be free from all errors against faith or morals, and substantially in conformity with the original texts of Sacred Scripture.

The third and concluding volume, containing the *Introductio Exegetica* and *Biblical Archæology*, is to appear in the course of the following year.

Niccolò Machiavelli and his Times. By Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by LINDE VILLARI. In Two Volumes. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co.

THESE two handsome volumes contain a translation of the first half—the only portion as yet published—of Professor Villari's new work. The translation has been executed by an accomplished

English lady, once Madame Mazini (not Mazzini), who is now the wife of the learned author.

Professor Villari's name stands so high—and, in many respects, so deservedly high—that it is hardly necessary to say anything as to the respect with which every production of his pen is received by historical scholars. The present undertaking, judging from this instalment of it, will not be inferior to his former productions, and those who are unable to peruse it in the original will find it faithfully represented in Madame Villari's pages. In Germany, where, too, an excellent translation of it has appeared, it is reckoned by many competent critics his best work.

Our own view of the times of Machiavelli is in many essential particulars very different from that of Signor Villari, but even to indicate the principal points of difference would lead us far beyond the limits to which we are here confined. We certainly agree with the Professor's opening remark, that "it would be difficult to find any period in the history of modern Europe equal in importance with that distinguished in history under the name of the Renaissance" (p. 1). And we think he would agree with us that the point of view from which a man surveys this period is very much influenced by his first principles. Our largest common ground with the Professor must necessarily be where he confines himself to concrete facts. And therefore the second of these volumes, which contains the narrative of Machiavelli's life down to his dismissal from the office of Secretary of the Ten, and which is enriched by a very valuable appendix of original documents, appears to us of more worth than the first volume of introductory matter, where generalizations, abstraction, and deductions abound. But, even as to questions of fact, we are frequently obliged to withhold our assent from the Professor, because he too frequently and too implicitly follows authorities whose testimony seems to us, for various reasons and in various degrees, untrustworthy.

So much must suffice for the present regarding these volumes. When the work is complete, we hope to be able to discuss it at much greater length.

The Fathers for English Readers: S. Augustine. By W. R. CLARK, M.A., Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Taunton. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

THIS little volume is planned and executed in a manner upon the whole very creditable to its author. The problem before him was, how in some two hundred pages to give an account of the great Saint and Doctor which should be intelligible and interesting to an unlearned reader. Mr. Clark thought that the best solution of this problem would be found by recounting "the early history of his life, and, indeed, the outward history of nearly his whole career, in the form of a continuous narrative;" and then grouping together

"his work and his opinions under the heads of the various controversies in which he was engaged" (p. 5). Accordingly the first four chapters are biographical; then we have chapters on the Manichæan, Donatist, and Pelagian controversies, and the dispute with Saint Jerome. Next come chapters upon the various writings of the Saint, upon his exposition of Holy Scripture and his preaching; and, finally, there is a chapter upon his last days. Mr. Clark writes throughout in a respectful and reverential spirit; his book is evidently the result of wide reading and much thought, and we are quite sure he is never intentionally unfair. An Anglican clergyman of the High Church school, he manifests indeed, upon occasion, as is natural enough, a certain amount of bias. Thus, his account of the condemnation of Celestius and Pelagius by Pope Zosimus (p. 114) suffers in clearness and accuracy from his reluctance—no doubt unconscious—to recognise the fact of the supreme jurisdiction of the Apostolic See asserted in such large terms in the Pope's letter to Aurelius. So, too, in writing of the Donatist controversy, he hardly appears to realise what the essential point at issue was. Most of our readers will doubtless remember how powerfully the study of that controversy affected Cardinal Newman when he was drawing near the Catholic Church, and how much he was helped by a paper regarding it, contributed to this REVIEW forty years ago by the late Cardinal Wiseman. Still, so far as it goes, Mr. Clark's volume is valuable, and we wish for it a wide circulation. To diffuse knowledge regarding the Fathers of the Church must do good—must, in the long run, help the progress of the Church. No unprejudiced person, no layman of fair intelligence and moderate candour, could, we venture to affirm, read this little book without arriving at the conclusion that S. Augustine belonged to a school essentially removed from that which numbers Mr. Clark among its adherents; that the Christianity of his age was radically different from any form or phase of Anglicanism. It is abundantly clear—no Protestant writer of repute ever ventures to impugn it—that the Saint's creed rested upon authority. His famous saying (Con. Ep. Man. i. 6), "I should not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to do so," reveals the very fundamental basis of his doctrine. The great question rests now exactly where it did then. It is a question of authority or private judgment. It is not a question of conflict of authorities, for surely there is but one communion in the world which claims the submission of all men as an infallible authority coming from God: one Church which demands implicit obedience as the voice of Him who cannot lie. Only he who cleaves to this One Church—Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman—can say in the language of S. Augustine: "The consent of peoples and nations detains me; the authority which was initiated by miracles, nurtured by hope, augmented by charity, confirmed by antiquity, detains me; the succession of priests, even to the present Episcopate, from the very See of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord committed His sheep to be fed after His resurrection, detains me; finally, the very name of Catholic detains me, which that Church has

alone, and not without reason, obtained among so many heretics" (De Util. Creden. i. 35).

Six Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Ecclesiastical Cases (1850—1872), with an Historical Introduction, Notes, and Index. Edited by WILLIAM G. BROOKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition. C. Kegan Paul and Co.

IN this volume, now in its third edition, Mr. Brooke has given the text of the judgments pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the cases of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, *Liddell v. Westerton*, *Williams v. the Bishop of Salisbury*, *Martin v. Mac-konochie*, *Hebbert v. Purchas*, and *Sheppard v. Bennett*—judgments of capital importance towards a correct appreciation of the true teaching of the Church of England, and of the tenableness of the ground assumed by certain Anglicans of the advanced High Church school. These documents supply abundant materials for the answer of the question, "Is Ritualism honest?" The honesty of individual Ritualists is, of course, a very different matter. The following summary—and it is a very fair and accurate one—is given by Mr. Brooke, at the end of his volume, of the points ruled by the Court in the six judgments of which he has previously furnished the full text:—

With reference to the ornaments of the Established Church and of the ministers thereof, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, the following points have been ruled:—

The Church of England has no altar of sacrifice (pp. 69—73, 238, 255, 256, 257). The Lord's Table must be of wood, and movable (pp. 73, 253—257). A Stone Altar is illegal (p. 73). Lighted candles on the Lord's Table during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, when not wanted for the purposes of light, are unlawful (pp. 122—129). The use of incense during the administration of Holy Communion is unlawful (p. 108). The use of embroidered linen and lace on the Holy Table during the administration of the Holy Communion is unlawful (p. 76). The mixed chalice is unlawful (pp. 108, 185—187). Wafer bread is illegal (pp. 187—191).‡

The use of the Chasuble, Albe, and Tunicle while officiating in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is illegal (p. 184).

The following points in connection with the Rubrics governing the administration of the Lord's Supper have been ruled:—

The celebrating Priest, during the Prayer of Consecration, must stand and not kneel, or prostrate himself, before the Consecrated Elements (pp. 118—122); bowing with the knee is kneeling and unlawful (pp. 142—146); bowing the head down towards the Table, and remaining some seconds in that position, is prostration, and unlawful (pp. 156, 158).

The north side of the Table, where the chancel faces the east, is the proper place for the celebrating Priest during the Communion Service, and also during the Prayer of Consecration (pp. 191—196). To stand at the north end of the west side, or with back to the people, is unlawful (pp. 193—198).

To elevate the cup, paten, or bread more than is necessary to take it into the hand of the Priest during the administration of the Holy Communion is unlawful (pp. 140, 157).

The following points in relation to the doctrine of the Church on the Lord's Supper have been ruled :—

The Church of England has no sacrificial altar (p. 238), nor any propitiatory offering on the Lord's Table (p. 239). To teach that the sacrifice, or offering, of Christ can be repeated is illegal (p. 239).

The Church of England does not affirm any presence in the Lord's Supper except a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver (p. 234). To adore the Consecrated Elements is illegal (p. 242).

Old English Drama: Select Plays. Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Greene's Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Edited by A. W. WARD, M.A., Professor of History and English Literature in the Owens College, Manchester. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1878.

PROFESSOR WARD has done very good service in making more easily accessible to the ordinary reader two of the best plays of our pre-Shakspearian drama. The introduction, which occupies over 110 pages, is really excellent, and is quite a monograph on the whole subject of the "Faust-story," although Mr. Ward's style is occasionally rather cumbrous and awkward. The chief points he establishes are, concerning Faust himself, that he was neither a mere legendary personage nor yet the printer Fust, but a real person, probably Dr. Johann Faust, whose public life it will be safe to assign "to some time between the years 1510 and 1540;" round whom, however, gathered all the floating legends concerning magic and magicians that had been common, some even for centuries, and had got a fresh impetus at the Reformation. Concerning Marlowe's great tragedy, he establishes pretty certainly that it must have been founded on the very first edition of the *Faustbuch*, the first literary form of the legend of which we know, and which was printed at Frankfort in 1587; that the play itself was probably first performed "before February, 1589, and very possibly in 1588, or even 1587;" the German *Faustbuch* may very likely have been brought over by some of those English comedians who, we know, went about performing in Germany before 1588; lastly, that all subsequent dramatic renderings of Faust, German or otherwise, were founded on Marlowe's tragedy, which was known and even acted in Germany at least as early as 1626. Less of the introduction is devoted to Friar Bacon than to Faust and Marlowe; but the account of the great Franciscan is of exceeding interest.

One of the greatest of Mr. Ward's merits is his adoption for *Dr. Faustus* of the text of the 1604 quarto. The other editions are so much interpolated with matter altogether unworthy of Marlowe, as to be quite disfigured; and it is impossible to get a right appreciation of the power of the great dramatist in them. In Mr. Ward's excellent text, and with the aid of his copious notes, it may be read with real pleasure. Concerning the final scene (xivth), he quotes Mr. Fleay as calling it "the only dramatic death-bed scene which can be compared

in horror to 2 Henry VI., iii. 3," but we should hardly hesitate to rank the death-scene of Dr. Faustus above that of Cardinal Beaufort.

Life of Father Benvenuto Bambozzi, O.M.C. By Rev. Father NICHOLAS TREGGIARI, of the same Institute. Translated and abridged from the second edition of the Italian original, by a Lay-tertiary of Saint Francis. London: Washbourne. 1879.

THIS is an interesting and edifying narrative of the life of a modern saint. The story reads like a chapter of some Franciscan chronicle of the Middle Ages. Yet the holy Minor Conventual only died in 1875, and was himself one of the victims of the suppression of the Religious Orders which was decreed by the Italian Government in 1861. The poor friars who served the basilica of S. Joseph of Cupertino at Osimo thought that royal favour would have spared them. In September, 1861, the sons of Victor Emmanuel, on their way to see the battle-field of Castelfidardo, which is only a few miles from Osimo, were shown the basilica and the body of S. Joseph by the friars. But they were suppressed all the same, and, curiously enough, the decree of expulsion was dated on the very day of the visit of the royal princes. Father Bambozzi was a native of Osimo, and lived all his life either in that ancient town or elsewhere within the limits of the old province of Picenum, of which "Auximum" was the capital. The quaint life of that primitive region, the honest simplicity of its peasants, the apostolic labours of its clergy, the strong faith and piety of its people, are all reflected in this attractive little book. Father Bambozzi, leaving his sanctity out of the question—the "cause" of his canonization has been already begun—seems to have been a man of the best peasant type of Central Italy—busy, active, shrewd, and sincere, with a special faculty for putting his ideas into racy and humoristic forms of speech. The original work from which the present translation and abridgment is taken seems to be written on the plan of those biographies which take every opportunity of making "improving" remarks. This is no harm in a spiritual book; but such remarks have a tendency to commonplace. The holy man's own contributions are by no means commonplace, and the few sentences quoted in his own original words make us long to have more. In translating these excessively idiomatic sentences, and also in condensing the whole work, and presenting it in readable English, the translator has fairly succeeded. We must not omit to acknowledge some excellent "translator's" notes.

The Poetical Works of Robert Stephen Hawker, Vicar of Morwenstow. Arranged by J. G. GOLDWIN. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

ROBERT STEPHEN HAWKER was received into the Catholic Church the evening before he died, August 14, 1875. Those of his friends who really knew him were in no way astonished. Readers of

this, the first complete edition of his poems, will also understand how it was he sent for the Catholic priest at the last. His verses are full of Christianity, of worship, of sacraments, of the Saints, and of the Church. Moreover, they are full of real poetry. We would quote his "Song of the Western Men," were it not so well known. But there is another brief lyric which shows almost as remarkably that union of "suggestive" description with intense dramatic power which the legend-versifier of a wild historic coast ought to display.

MAWGAN OF MELHUACH.

'Twas a fierce night when old Mawgan died,
Men shuddered to hear the rolling tide:
The wreckers fled fast from the awful shore,
They had heard strange voices amid the roar.

"Out with the boat there," some one cried,—
"Will he never come? we shall lose the tide:
His berth is trim and his cabin stored,
He's a weary long time coming on board."

The old man struggled upon the bed;
He knew the words that the voices said;
Wildly he shrieked as his eyes grew dim,
"He was dead! he was dead! when I buried him."

Hark yet again to the devilish roar,—
"He was nimbler once with a ship on shore;
Come! come! old man, 'tis a vain delay,
We must make the offing by break of day."

Hard was the struggle, but at the last,
With a stormy pang old Mawgan passed,
And away, away, beneath their sight,
Gleamed the red sail at pitch of night.

A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs. By HENRY BRUGSCH-BEY.
Translated from the German by the late HENRY DANBY SEYMOUR,
F.R.G.S.; completed and edited by PHILIP SMITH, B.A. Coloured
Plates and Maps. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street.
1879.

THIS is a book of great value, and a standard work on Egyptian History. The author has made Egyptology his life study. For some years he held office under the Khedive, and has personally inspected well-nigh every monument in Egypt or papyrus in the museums of Europe. His work on Egyptian Geography, and his Dictionary of Hieroglyphics, rank him among the first Egyptologists of the day. About twenty years back Dr. Brugsch published in French a smaller work on Egyptian History; and two years ago he wrote, in German, a larger and more complete work, of which this book is a good translation, well brought out. The value of the work lies in the support it gives to Biblical History. It has fallen to Egyptologists to

vindicate the historical character of a great portion of Sacred Scripture, and thus put to confusion the unsubstantial theorizing of mythologists, and the ignorant carplings of sceptics. Like the ibis and the ichneumon, the sacred animals of Egypt, they have destroyed the crocodile's eggs and the serpent brood of modern rationalism. The older commentators were loth to acknowledge the Egyptian origin of many rites and ceremonies in the Pentateuch. But Egyptologists show that no stronger evidence of the authenticity of the Pentateuch can be adduced than the undeniable fact that its author must have learned all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and that, too, in the very time of the Ramessids. Egyptian monuments have a lesson, too, for those who boast of modern progress and despise the remote past as an age of barbarism. These monuments, Dr. Brugsch says, refute with scorn the geological fiction of a "stone, a bronze, and an iron age." The very earliest monuments prove that granite, too hard for modern steel, was carved with ease, and they surpass modern work, as much in the exactness of their masonry as in the grandeur of their proportions. "Beside them," Dr. Brugsch says, "our brick boxes full of windows, erected with the help of steam and the most complete appliances of machinery," are contemptible. He describes the colossal figures in the rock-temple of Ibsambul "as standing out from the wall of a rock like giant forms of olden time, and with a disdainful smile upon their lips looking down upon the pigmy race at their feet."

The history of Egypt, though most ancient, is in a certain sense very new. It is a modern revelation, disinterred from sepulchral hieroglyphics and mummified papyri. Of the earlier portions scarcely anything was known except from Greek sources. And how little these were worth is clear from the fact that Herodotus, "the father of history," was so simple as to believe that the inscriptions on the pyramids recorded the quantity of garlic consumed by the builders. Still it must be admitted that the monuments of Egypt are disappointing to historians. They pass over very interesting periods without a word; they are full of vainglorious boasting, and say nothing of defeat. The monuments of the Hyksos, in whose times it is agreed that Joseph and his brethren came down into Egypt, have been purposely destroyed. Dr. Brugsch shows that there were at different times frequent settlements of Semitic peoples in Lower Egypt, and their influence was very great. The Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, were probably of this race. This will explain the welcome given to the Hebrews, and the hatred of the native Egyptians, which finally led to the expulsion of the foreign kings, and the accession of a native dynasty which knew not Joseph. It is clearly proved that Rameses II., the Sesostris of the Greeks, was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his son Manephta II., the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Zoan-Tanis, the Rameses of the Scripture narrative, was the city of their abode. Though the monuments say nothing about the Hebrews or their departure, they show that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was just the weak, mean man that Moses describes. He had the meanness to carve his own name on other kings' monuments. As to the

route of the Exodus, Dr. Brugsch has a new and startling theory of his own. He drowns Pharaoh not in the Red Sea, but in the Serbonian Lake—a lagoon on the shores of the Mediterranean, where Artaxerxes in later times lost a great part of his army. In addition to strong geographical reasons, drawn from the sites of places named in Exodus, he has been led to adopt this view from a very early and detailed account of the pursuit of some fugitive slaves from the royal city of Rameses. Other Egyptologists, according to Mr. Stuart Poole, in the *March Contemporary*, are not yet agreed upon the value of Dr. Brugsch's evidence for his revolutionary theory.

Besides Biblical matters there are many things of interest to the general reader. For instance, some light is thrown by the monuments on the position of women in ancient Egypt. They enjoyed the fullest liberty and equality, or rather precedence. They were not excluded either from the temples of Amon or the thrones of the Pharaohs. Still it must be confessed that Egyptian women do not appear to advantage in monumental history. Mural paintings exhibit their vanity and intemperance. Queen Hashop, the sister-wife of Thutmes II., is a strange character, about whom we should like to know more. But her name and history have been carefully expunged from most of her monuments, even as she herself erased the name of her deceased husband; a curious instance of stern monumental justice. This queen assumed a king's dress and a masculine style, yet her acts evince very feminine vanity and jealousy. Another queen signalized herself by introducing a strange heresy into the national religion—the worship of the sun's disc. The monuments contain just one word of encouragement to Egyptian bondholders. A painting in the tomb of Khamhat, the finance minister of Amenhotep III. exhibits taxpayers, of their own free will, paying over and above the amount required, and then going home quite contented, saying, "The king has shown himself upon his throne. The taxpayers of the north and south of Egypt have been rewarded" (vol. i. p. 438). No doubt the present ruler of Egypt would rejoice if his creditors could be so easily satisfied.

The Life of S. Patrick: Apostle of Ireland. By WILLIAM BULLEN MORRIS, Priest of the Oratory. Second Edition. London: Burns and Oates. 1878.

THE Patriarch and Apostle who laboured with so signal and permanent success that fourteen centuries after his death, "in the Vatican Council, no saint had so many mitred sons" as he, was necessarily a giant in his day. Tillemont says that God led him "in the ways of the prophets and apostles," to whom he bore a greater resemblance than to later saints; more especially, as he adds, do "we see in him much of the character of S. Paul." The complaint of the modern biographers of S. Patrick is that the prodigies related of him by his ancient biographers are received with incredulity, because they are unlike those of more recent saints. In the introductory chapter

of his life of S. Patrick, Father Morris appeals to his Catholic readers for a fairer hearing and judgment. They are reminded both of the similarity of the wonders related of him with those attributed by contemporaries to S. Anthony of Egypt, S. Gregory, Thaumaturgus, and others; and of the significant fact that if the miracles of S. Patrick want such authorization as would follow the rigid inquiry in a process for canonization, they have that other authorization scarcely, if at all, less powerful—their *results*: the complete conversion of Ireland and its steadfast loyalty through a wearily long history of opposition, persecution, exile, trial of every sort, to the first faith learned from its great Apostle. So that, to apply the famous dilemma for the miracles of early Christianity—the work which S. Patrick did and which lives to our day, is a greater marvel if done without the aid of his miracles than the miracles themselves are. And it is easier to believe the work *with* than the work *without* the wonders related of him. “Unchanging tradition and the religious life of the people” witness, therefore, in our day to S. Patrick in Ireland, as by S. Basil’s testimony they did in his day to Gregory Thaumaturgus in Pontus.

“The original idea of this short sketch of S. Patrick’s life,” Fr. Morris tells us, “was purely devotional:” nor has he deviated much from that original idea except to preface his sketch with an inquiry into the sources from which the biographer of the saint has to draw. He gives a singularly clear and interesting account of the ancient lives of the saint contained in the collection of Father Colgan, “the greatest of Irish hagiographers,” and of their evidential value. His object, therefore, is not with the “erudite pleasantries” that S. Patrick was the precursor of Protestantism in Ireland, nor with the so-called arguments of its upholders: he has a word for them, however, in passing, and always a pertinent and telling word. His verdict on Dr. Todd’s work is that that writer has attempted to make the facts of the saint’s life speak for his own foregone conclusion, “with so little success that in the end the impression left by the book is that his conclusions signally overthrow his premises” (p. 18). S. Patrick in his Confession “makes a short profession of his faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation,” whereupon the Rev. Messrs. Gough, Gubbins, and Olden compare this with the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and triumphantly contrast the profession of faith of modern Rome with that of ancient Ireland. And Mr. Olden (“Epistles, &c., of S. Patrick,” by Rev. T. Olden, M.R.I.A., p. 39) sagaciously reflects: “From this comparison it is obvious that S. Patrick knew nothing of the twelve new articles added to the primitive faith by the Church of Rome.” On which Fr. Morris pithily remarks: “It is only necessary to observe that baptism and belief in the Holy Scriptures are included in those *new* articles, about which, according to Mr. Olden, S. Patrick *knew nothing*” (p. 159). An equally happy and effective reply is given to the Bardic theory, which still finds defenders (pp. 4, 11).

Having thus cleared away difficulties and replied to opponents, the Life proper of the saint commences. The writing of this is both able and pleasing: it is a well-ordered and succinct narrative in a style

marked by a simplicity, and sometimes almost a quaintness, admirably befitting the theme. The life is written with sufficient care and dependence on primitive authorities—to which frequent references are made—to serve the purposes of the student desirous to know the facts concerning a great man who changed a country's history; whilst the story runs from beginning to end with so much clearness, and is warmed by such a spirit of devotion for the saint of God, as makes it an acceptable book for spiritual reading. Both the student and the novice will find it a pleasant book. The author is to be congratulated on his success. A difficulty—not the least he had to contend with—must have been to secure the brevity he aimed at, without giving an incomplete picture; for the story of our Apostle and Thaumaturgus, living to one hundred and twenty years and never idle, is not easily compressed. This quality of brevity without a suspicion of dryness ought to make the volume as acceptable to English as to Irish readers. It would be but an evil consequence of the enthusiastic national admiration of S. Patrick if it led Englishmen to suppose that his life belonged exclusively to his own special children, and had little interest or lesson for themselves. The mere fact that S. Patrick came over to Britain with S. Germanus and had an active share in his work against Pelagianism in our isle, ought to create a link of sympathy between us and him. But, far beyond this, the labours of the children have bound us in gratitude to the Father. It is the Irish people, with the Irish priests, Irish nuns, and Irish teachers who have mainly contributed to advance the “second spring” in England; and as to the past, as Montalembert says, “more than two-thirds of England owed its final conversion exclusively to the labours of Irish monks” (tom. iv. p. 128, quoted by Fr. Morris).

The Description of Ireland and the State thereof, as it is at this present.
In anno 1598. Dublin: Gill.

THIS important work, edited by Father Hogan, S.J., will be of immense advantage to every student of Irish history. It consists of a concise description of every county in Ireland in the year 1598, with a list of the principal towns, castles, and families. It is to Ireland in some respects what the Domesday Book is to England. It was not compiled with the same fulness, it is true, but still its value as an historical monument cannot be over-estimated. It supplies important statistical information, regarding many places and families in Ireland, which cannot be had from any other source. The manuscript Father Hogan states to have been written between the years 1756 and 1811. The original was written in the year 1598 by an English officer. Father Hogan's copious notes cannot be passed over without a word of notice. They contain a mine of information, and cannot fail to prove of great advantage to every accurate student of Irish archæology.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1879.

ART. I.—THE EARLY SCOTTISH CHURCH.

1. *Celtic Scotland: a History of Ancient Alban.* By WILLIAM F. SKENE. Vol. II. *Church and Culture.* Edinburgh, 1877.
2. *Kalendars of Scottish Saints, with Personal Notices of those of Alba, Laudonia, and Strathelyde.* By ALEXANDER PENROSE FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. Edinburgh, 1872.

AN ancient tradition in the Scottish Church derived from Pope St. Victor, the first introduction of Christianity into the country. According to this tradition, Donald, who reigned over one of the early tribal kingdoms at the close of the second century, received the faith at the preaching of two apostolic men, Marcus and Dionysius, who were sent from Rome, and his example was followed by all the people who acknowledged his sway.* The tradition was expressed in a couplet, which, if the versification wants polish, has at least, says Bishop Leslie, age to recommend it:—

Christi transactis tribus annis atque ducentis
Scotia Catholicam cœpit inire fidem.†

An early Christianity in Britain is beyond controversy. The evidence may be shadowy that would connect it with either of the great Apostles. It has been said that St. Peter, when the edict of Claudius expelled all Jews from Rome, travelled into the western provinces of the Empire, and passing into Britain,

* Breviarium Aberdonense, July 6.

† De rebus gestis Scotorum, L. iii.

there sowed the first seeds of faith; that the preaching of St. Paul was heard in the island—

Transit et oceanum vel qua facit insula portum
Quasque Britannus habet terras, atque ultima Thule.*

But it is unquestionable that among those whom choice or necessity led in the track of the Roman legions there were some who had embraced the faith of Christ. The first record in profane history of a conversion to Christianity is that of Pomponia Græcina, wife of the Proconsul Plautius, whose conquests in Britain were the first permanent acquisition in the island. She was a disciple of the Apostles, and under Nero was accused as guilty of a foreign superstition.† Claudia, the wife of Pudens, was a British lady. And both lived in the first century. It is difficult to believe that the zeal of the Christians introduced into Britain with the Roman arms kept the Gospel a privilege of the Roman province, without seeking to transmit its influence to the native Celts beyond the wall of Adrian. Making every allowance for the unwillingness of hostile races to receive the institutions of their enemies, it is still highly probable that even while the contest between them lasted, the faith made its way into the north; and among the prisoners carried off by the Caledonians in their fierce inroads, there may well have been some who would convey the truth to their barbarous captors. In whatever way Christianity was first carried into those parts, we have the testimony of Tertullian, himself a contemporary of Pope Victor, as to its existence in the island beyond the limits of the Roman domination.‡ The faithful in Britain escaped the first fury of persecution, and it was not till the edict of Dioclesian and Maximian that they saw their churches levelled and themselves obliged to take refuge in mountains and forests. Many fugitives—for in their long security the Christians must have multiplied—would retire from the Roman province, and seek safety beyond the pale of its civilization, and thus a new accession would be made to the infant church in northern Britain.

With the slender evidence based on vague and ambiguous expressions, and in the complete absence of documentary proof, it is impossible to conjecture to what extent the evangelization

* Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita S. Martini*, l. iii., 493.

† "Superstitionis externæ ream." Tacitus, *Annal.* xiii. 32. De Rossi has almost established the identity of Pomponia Græcina and Lucina, the first of the name, celebrated in the Roman Martyrologies. *Roma Sott.* ii. 361.

‡ "Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita." Tertull., *Adv. Judæos.* vii.

of Scotland had been carried before the return of St. Ninian from Rome. Of this holy man, the first apostle of the Lowland Scots, our earliest authentic record is in Bede. Describing the arrival of St. Columba, he says that his mission was to the inhabitants of the northern portion of the country, who were separated by wild and lofty mountain ranges from their southern neighbours of the Pictish race.

For the southern Picts who dwelt on this side of those mountains had long before, as they relate, forsaken the errors of idolatry, and embraced the true faith, at the preaching of Nynias, a most reverend Bishop and holy man of the nation of the Britons, who at Rome had been regularly instructed in the faith and mysteries of the truth (*qui erat Romæ regulariter fidem et mysteria veritatis edoctus*), whose episcopal see, famous for its dedication to St. Martin, and for its church, where he and many other saints rest in the body, now is possessed by the nation of the Angles.*

Aelred, the Cistercian Abbot of Rievaulx, in Yorkshire, who had been educated in Scotland along with Henry, son of King David, is the next authority for the life of St. Ninian. He wrote seven hundred years after the death of the saint, but his materials are drawn, as he himself tells us, from a book *barbario (sic) scriptus*, which must be presumed of a much earlier date. Saint Ninian was the son of a Christian prince, and was born in the district afterwards called Galloway, at Whithern, the scene of his future episcopate, named also by his biographer Rosnat. He was baptized in his infancy, spent a holy boyhood and youth, and feeling a desire to go to Rome proceeded thither in the pontificate of St. Damasus. He remained many years in Rome, where he devoted himself to study, knowing what need of sound doctrine there was in his own country, where unskilled teachers had taught himself and others much that could not be approved. After making great progress in knowledge and virtue he was consecrated bishop by Pope Siricius, the successor of Damasus, and received from him a mission to his native country, to men who had not received the faith of our Saviour, or who had heard the word of the Gospel from heretics, or from men not rightly instructed in the law of God. The date of this mission must have been soon after 394. Returning home through Gaul he visited the great St. Martin of Tours, to learn from him the rules and institutions of that monastic life which had attained under his direction so remarkable a development. From him, too, he borrowed masons that he might construct a church after the Roman

* Hist. Eccles., L. iii. c. 4.

model. He was welcomed to his diocese, and immediately selected his native Rosnat, there to build the first stone church in Britain. Before it was completed he heard of the death of St. Martin, and to him he dedicated his foundation. Aelred describes Whithern as on the shore, running far into the sea, and closed in by it on the east, west, and south, and approached only by land from the north. This description may apply to the Isle of Whithern, where the ruins of a chapel of unknown date are still to be seen, but may equally apply to the entire peninsula of Wigton; and the site of Rosnat, the "Candida Casa" of St. Ninian, would be the town of Whithern, some miles inland, where the cathedral of Galloway, beautiful in its ruins, still recalls the memory of Scotland's first apostle.

The labours of the saint were not confined to the immediate neighbourhood of his "White Church," nor to the district in later times comprised in the bishopric of Galloway, on the north side of the Solway Firth, and extending from the Nith to the Irish Channel. Through his preaching all the southern Picts who inhabited the country south of the Grampians abandoned their idolatrous worship and embraced the true faith. He ordained bishops and priests, and divided the country into districts, appointing missionaries to each.* After nearly forty years' labour he returned to Whithern, where his death is placed in the year 432, the same that saw St. Patrick land in Ireland. His "Great Monastery" (*magnum monasterium*), founded on the model of St. Martin's "Greater Monastery" (*majus monasterium*) of Marmoutier, was long a seminary of secular and religious instruction, to which many resorted to be trained in the monastic discipline that St. Ninian brought from Gaul. It was from it that the monastic rule first passed into Ireland when Cairnech, "Bishop and Abbot of the House of Martin," crossed into Ulster, shortly before Finnian of Clonard, from St. David's monastery in Wales, introduced the same institutions into the south. For several generations the intercourse was kept up, and in the school of Rosnat, or Candida Casa, were sown the seeds of that great organization which, spreading over Ireland, was destined a century later to return to Scotland with St. Columba, and to produce a revival of Christian fervour unparalleled in the history of missionary life.

By this time the churches in the southern portion of Britain began to suffer from the inroads of Pelagianism. To oppose a barrier to this heresy and bring back to Catholic unity those who had become its victims, Pope Celestine I., at the instance

* Chron. S. Prosper. *Ed. Migne*, p. 594.

of Palladius, a deacon of the Roman Church, delegated St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre. Two years later, in the consulate of Bassus and Antiochus (A.D. 431), Palladius himself was consecrated Bishop by St. Celestius, and sent to the Scots believing in Christ.* St. Prosper of Aquitaine relates to the glory of that pontiff how he refused to put Celestius again on his defence, when his cause had been fully examined and his doctrines once condemned, how he expelled him from Italy, and with unbending constancy upheld the decisions of his predecessors and the synodical decrees, firmly declining to reopen a discussion on what had been, after mature deliberation, declared heresy.

Nor was he less diligent in freeing Britain from the same plague, when he expelled some enemies of grace, who occupied the land that gave the heresy birth, even from that secluded retreat in mid-ocean, and ordaining a Bishop for the Scots, while he laboured to preserve the Catholic faith in what was the Roman island, made Christian what was barbarous.†

The mission of St. Palladius seems to have been to the entire nation of the Scots, not merely to those who from Ireland had established themselves along the western shores of North Britain, nor yet with an exclusive view to evangelize the Scots in Ireland. St. Patrick's mission to the sister island dates from the following year 432, and although Christianity may have been planted in some parts previous to the arrival of the great apostle, it had taken no firm root in the country; but of Pelagianism, which St. Palladius was especially commissioned to exterminate, there is at this time no trace in Ireland. The merit of making the "barbarous island" Christian still belongs to Pope St. Celestine, and his is likewise the merit of preserving the purity of the Catholic faith among the colonies of Scots who in Britain had received it from earlier missionaries.

The first scene of St. Palladius's labours appears to have been Ireland. If we believe the early Irish historians, he was ill received by the inhabitants, and, being compelled to take ship again, sailed away to the north. Continuing his course round the island he landed in Scotland. He found himself among people who were Christians, but without a Bishop, for he was beyond the region where St. Ninian and his followers had left churches fully organized. Presbyters and monks, says

* Basso et Antiocho Coss. Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Coelestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur. S. Prosp. Chron., p. 595, *Ed. Migne*.

† S. Prosp. Contra Collat., c. xxi.

the lesson of the Aberdeen Breviary, were the ministers of the sacraments, and they followed only the rites and customs of the Primitive Church. He was well received, and went preaching through all Scotland, enforcing ecclesiastical discipline and introducing Roman rites. If the Picts, more removed from the influence of St. Ninian's foundation, had not quite lapsed into heathenism, it is clear that they had become cold in their practices; and if they deserved the severe epithet of apostates, which St. Patrick applied to them (*Ep. ad Coroticum*) their faith, too, was tarnished. From him St. Ternan received baptism, a native of the Mearns, who became High Bishop ("Ardepscop") of the Picts and fixed his seat at Abernethy in Strathearn, the capital of the Pictish kingdom, and the mother church of St. Andrews. He ordained for the Orkneys St. Servanus,* and thus provided for the north and centre of Scotland the hierarchical organization and succession which in the south was already established round the primitive see of Candida Casa. After an apostolate of nearly twenty years, St. Palladius died, about 450. His relics long reposed at Fordun in the Mearns, where his name is still commemorated in the Padie Fair held on his day, July 6.

The arrival of St. Columba (563) marks another epoch in the history of the ancient Scottish Church.

There came from Ireland into Britain a priest and abbot of venerable monastic habit and saintly life, named Columba, to preach the Word of God in the northern provinces of the Picts, that is, in the districts cut off from the southern regions of the same people by wild and lofty mountain ranges.†

This patriarch of the Irish monks was in the forty-second year of his age when he resolved to quit his native land that he loved so well, but where his presence was an occasion of strife. A voluntary exile, he bade adieu to Ireland, and with twelve disciples sailed across to Britain. He landed among the Scots of Dalriada, whose territories at the time appear to have been confined to the peninsula of Kintyre and Knapdale, including perhaps the district of Cowal in Argyllshire. The neighbouring islands, too, were occupied by the colonists, and, before the arrival of Columba, Mull and Iona had passed into their possession. Christians themselves, their conquests were all won to the Christian Church. Driven back by the Picts, in 560, from their frontier settlements, the Christian establishment of the Dalriads may have remained. Close to the debated territory

* Brev. Aberdon. Pars Æstiva., fol. xxv.

† Bede, H. E., l. c.

and the confines of paganism, an advanced post in this region presented itself to Columba, bent on the conversion of the Picts, as specially suited for the commencement of his mission. Here accordingly he established himself with his followers. Landing on Iona, on Whitsun Eve, 563, he prepared to do battle with the surrounding paganism, in the spirit of the parent monastic church of Ireland. He founded a monastery, establishing its community in all the practices of the most austere virtue and self-denial that distinguished his character and race. His banishment, the great sorrow of his life, he could not forget, but the indomitable energy of the *insulanus miles* found a new vent in missionary enterprise. The island monastery became the centre of his operations, and first the neighbouring islands and the contiguous mainland, then all Scotland north of the Clyde and Forth, felt the influence of his labours. Morven and Lochaber were his first-fruits, and there, among a rural population, the faith sown by the great apostle survives to our day. In 565, two years after his first arrival, he crossed the western ridge of the great mountain barrier of Drumalban that still separated him from the main body of the Pictish kingdom, and made his way to the mouth of the Ness, near which was the royal residence of King Brude. The powerful monarch was baptized by the saint, and his example was soon followed by many in the rank of chiefs. In the work of winning over the people to the faith, Columba did not depart from the system followed among a kindred race in his own country, establishing monasteries among the tribes, exhibiting to that pagan society the perfection of the Christian life, and presenting in the purity and mortification of his religious colonists the loftiest ideal of disinterested holiness. Soon the whole nation was brought to profess the faith. Not only the Picts, but the Scots to the south of the Grampians, received the missionaries with open arms. Everywhere they planted communities of monks, and all regarded the island monastery of Iona as the mother church, and acknowledged her jurisdiction, the religious constituting one brotherhood, the "Family of Iona." To the Abbot of Iona they all owed subjection, and even the Bishops who were taken from their number, in matters of discipline obeyed the domestic superior, though only a priest—a remarkable usage which long lasted in the Scottish Church, from reverence to that first apostle who was not a Bishop, but a priest and monk.* The names of some of the monasteries founded by St. Columba or his followers are given by Adamnan, and in many local names that

* Bede, H. E., iii. 4.

recall the saint and his disciples the connection is still to be traced.

Of episcopal churches founded by these missionaries, the first to appear is Lismore, established by St. Moluoc or Lugadius; next Kingarth in Bute, founded by Bishop Cathan, and Eig, where Donnan settled in the lifetime of St. Columba. The numerous churches in the west Highlands, bearing the names of Kilmaluog, Kilchattan, and Kildonnan, if not foundations of the same holy men, testify at least to dedications in their honour. Even in the far north the dedications of Rosemarky, on the Moray Firth, and Mortlach, in the vale of the Fiddich, perpetuating the name of Maluog of Lismore, mark the extent of his missionary enterprise. It was another band of Columba's disciples that followed St. Machar. This missionary having been ordained Bishop, was admonished by Columba to found his church when he arrived at the bank of a river where its bendings form the figure of a Bishop's crosier.* This he found at the mouth of the Don; and here he fixed his residence, where the cathedral of Aberdeen afterwards rose in his honour. It was also during the lifetime of St. Columba that Gartnaidh, the successor of King Brude, who himself belonged to the nation of the Southern Picts, and had fixed his royal seat at Abernethy, on the southern bank of the Tay, rebuilt the church which had been founded in that place by King Nectan in 460, when the Southern Picts received the faith from St. Ninian. The older church had almost disappeared, and scarce the semblance of Christianity remained. Its restoration on this occasion is directly attributed to St. Columba, who was accompanied by his friend and disciple Cainnech, by descent a Pict. To Cainnech is due another foundation destined to eclipse the first, and the monastery which he raised in the eastern extremity of Fife, on the shore of the German Ocean, at a place called Kilrimont, or the Royal Mount, was in its turn to be absorbed by the church of St. Andrews, and the primacy from Abernethy transferred to the mouth of the Eden.

In 597 St. Columba completed thirty-four years of missionary labour in Scotland. The impassioned ardour of his zeal had borne marvellous fruits. He found Christianity among a handful of his countrymen in a few islands and half-severed peninsulas of the remote mainland. He left it firmly established in the outer as well as inner Hebrides, and spread over all the northern and western Highlands of Scotland. And far south of the Grampians the influence of his preaching was felt in the

* Breviar. Aberdonen., 12 Nov. See Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonen., *preface*, p. x.

regeneration of the "Apostate Picts." We do not find that he ever met with serious obstacles to his mission. The natural difficulties of the country opposed the chief barrier; everything else yielded to the stirring persuasion of his eloquence, and the charm of his holy life. Chiefs and people vied with each other in according the great apostle a willing welcome, and his memory still lives enshrined in the veneration and affection of the descendants of those he brought to the faith.

This century was one of intense missionary activity in North Britain. The district known as Cumbria, or the kingdom of the Strathclyde Britons, extended from the wall of Severus to the River Forth. This was the scene of the labours of St. Kentigern. Of royal descent, he was educated in his boyhood by St. Servanus, who loved him dearly for his holy virtues, and who used in his old age to call him Munghu, or the dear friend. After serious deliberation and earnest prayer, he decided to leave Culross, his early home. Following the divine inspiration he was conducted to Cathures, now Glasgow, near a church and cemetery formerly consecrated by St. Ninian. Soon a small community formed round the holy man, and ere long the king and people besought him to become their Bishop. Reluctantly he gave his consent, and was consecrated according to the British rite, when twenty-five years of age.* After his elevation his austerities increased; on foot he visited his diocese, which in great part had lapsed into heathenism, reforming abuses among the people and enforcing discipline among the clergy. The kingdom was divided into two factions, and a strong party was pagan. In the struggle for supremacy, the pagan party prevailed for a time, and the saint took refuge in Wales. He proceeded to Menevia, where St. David then ruled as Bishop. He founded the monastery of Llanelwy in the vale of Clwyd, a name probably given to it by the saint in memory of the river near which he had placed his original seat. The fame of his sanctity again drew to him multitudes anxious to live under his direction, and before his return to Cumbria nearly a thousand monks were assembled under his rule. In the north the battle of Ardderyd, in 573, decided the contest between the pagan and the Christian parties, and Christianity became dominant in Strathclyde. The victorious Rydderch Hael, or the Liberal, ascended the throne, and immediately

* In what consisted the peculiarity of this British rite is not quite clear. But some dread of irregularity seems to have attached to it. Jocelyn relates that St. Kentigern made several journeys to Rome, probably after he went to Wales, and there received from the Pope whatever was wanting in his consecration, privileges for his church, and books of the Holy Scriptures.

recalled the saint. Appointing St. Asaph his successor at Llanelwy, he took his departure with over six hundred of his monks. For a time he fixed his residence at Hoddam in Dumfriesshire, where he laboured to reorganize the southern portion of his distracted diocese. The people still clung to a paganism which was a cross between their old Celtic heathenism and that of their Anglic neighbours, in which idolatry, the worship of the elements, and their supreme deity Woden, were all combined. After spending several years among them to reclaim them from their profane rites and bring them back to a pure belief, and ordaining priests and clerics to preserve them in the landmarks of faith, the customs of the Church and the laws of the canons, he returned to his see at Glasgow. It was here, on the banks of the Mellendonor, that, according to Jocelyn, his meeting with St. Columba took place, and the two saints exchanged pastoral staves in pledge and testimony of their mutual love in Christ. St. Columba's was long preserved in Ripon in the church of St. Wilfrid. After passing several days together, conversing on the things of God and the interests of souls, whose salvation they both had so much at heart, "saying farewell, with mutual love they parted never to meet again."* St. Mungo died on the 13th January, probably in the year 603, and his body, clothed in his pontificals, was interred in the choir at the right-hand side of the altar. His tomb at this day in the cathedral of Glasgow contains his relics.†

The evangelization of Scotland was now complete. The first introduction of the Gospel, however effected, was followed up by a rapid succession of regularly organized missions. Two of these, the earliest in date, directly came from Rome. Ninian the Pict, trained in the schools of Damasus and Jerome, with the ordination of Siricius, brought back to his native Galloway the purity of Apostolic doctrine, which from the banks of the Solway he carried to the base of the Grampians; Palladius fulfilled the mission of Celestine in the North-eastern Lowlands; while from the islands and rugged coasts of the west, Columba and his followers overspread the mountainous regions of the north, descending again across the centre of the country till in friendly rivalry they encountered Kentigern advancing from the south. These apostles are now held in remembrance by few in Presbyterian Scotland. To many they are not known, save by a name attached to a ruined chapel, a village, a cavern, a fountain, or a market; and the descendants

* Jocelyn, *Vita S. Kentigerni*, c. xxxix.

† Forbes, "*Kalendars of Scottish Saints*," p. 372.

of those whom they baptized scarce honour them with the veneration they accord their legendary heroes.

Of the immediate successors of St. Kentigern in the see of Glasgow we have no notice. But from the continuator of Nennius it would appear that when, a quarter of a century later, the nation of the Northumbrian Angles received the faith, and their king Aeduin was baptized by St. Paulinus, the Bernician Angles occupying the district lying between the Tweed and the Forth were converted by their Cumbrian neighbours governed by a successor of St. Kentigern.

The church of Paulinus was short-lived, too short to have any permanent effect in leavening the people with Christianity. On the death of its first protector, King Aeduin, the infant church was swept away by the heathen Penda of Mercia, and the apostate Ceadwalla of Wales, who overran the country. The whole of the Cumbrian and Anglian districts were thrown into confusion. It is to the Columban church, established by King Oswald, that the permanent conversion of the Northumbrians and the Angles between the Tweed and Forth is to be ascribed. When the father of Oswald was slain by Aeduin, still a pagan, his sons and the principal young nobility took refuge among the Scots, and received a Christian education in the monastery of Iona. Returning with a small army, recruited probably from the Angles north of the Tweed, the easy and decisive victory of Hefenfeld, in 634, gained through the intercession of St. Columba,* placed Oswald on his paternal throne. Bede tells us that at once—

He sent to the seniors of the Scots, among whom he himself and his fellow-soldiers when in banishment had received the grace of baptism, desiring they would send him a Bishop, by whose instructions and ministry the Anglian nation which he governed might be taught the advantages of faith in the Lord and receive its sacraments.†

After one unsuccessful mission, that failed through the morose austerity of the preacher, a council of the monks fixed upon Aidan as one—

That deserved to be a Bishop, and ought to be sent to instruct the unbelievers and unlearned, since he was found to be endowed with the grace of a singular discretion which is the mother of other virtues; and accordingly, being ordained, they sent him to preach.‡

Instead of fixing his episcopal residence at York, where Paulinus had established his see, Aidan followed the custom of

* Adamnan, Vit. S. Columbæ, L. i. c. i.

† Bede, H. E., iii. c. 3.

‡ Ibid., c. 5.

his religious brethren in the north, and selected a small secluded island on the Northumbrian coast, where he founded a monastery and ruled it as Episcopal Abbot. After him, at Lindisfarne, the two functions continued to be regulated by the custom prevailing in the monastic Church of Scotland; and Bede tells us that till his day the Bishops of that place exercised the episcopal office in such sort, that while the abbot, who was chosen by the Bishop with the consent of the brethren, governed the monastery, all the priests, deacons, chanters, readers, and the other ecclesiastical orders, with the Bishop himself, observed in all things the monastic rule.* He also bears noble testimony to the efficiency of the church founded by Aidan, and to the missionary zeal of the many brethren who accompanied or followed him on his enterprise.

From that time many from the region of the Scots came daily into Britain, and with great devotion preached the word of faith to those provinces of the Angles over which King Oswald reigned; and those among them that had received priest's orders administered to the believers the grace of baptism. Churches were built in several places; the people joyfully flocked together to hear the Word; possessions and lands were given of the King's bounty to build monasteries; the younger Angles were by their Scottish masters instructed; and greater care and attention were bestowed upon the rules and observances of regular discipline.†

Among the foundations of Aidan was Coldingham, whose first abbess was Aebba, half-sister of King Oswald. He also founded the monastery of Melrose, with which the great name of St. Cuthbert is for ever associated. On the birth and parentage of St. Cuthbert, Bede, who wrote his life within forty years after his decease, is silent. He was watching his master's flocks on the southern slopes of the Lammermoors, when he saw in a vision the soul of Bishop Aidan carried to heaven by choirs of angels, and resolved in consequence to devote himself to the service of God in the religious life. He took the monastic habit at Melrose, where Boisil was prior, in the year 651. Ten years later, on the death of Boisil, Cuthbert was promoted to his place. After several years spent in training his community by counsel and example in the perfections of monastic discipline, and in correcting abuses among the surrounding populace, "part of whom, Christian in name, profaned their profession by wicked lives, and some disregarding the precepts of their religion had recourse to charms, incantations, or other forbidden acts, when they sought relief from their ail-

* Bede, in *Vita S. Cudbereti*, c. xvi.

† H. E., B. iii. c. 3. Skene, ii. 159.

ments," he was called to Lindisfarne by Eata, now abbot. This was in 664, the year that the Columban church in Northumbria came to an end.

Aidan, the first Bishop of the line, died in 651, and was succeeded in the episcopate by Finan, "who had been sent from Hii (Iona), the island and monastery of the Scots."* At his death, Colman was sent out of Scotia† and made Bishop. Under his episcopate the controversy about the celebration of Easter and the form of the tonsure was brought to its height, and the Council of Whitby declared against the Scottish custom. Eata the abbot, and Cuthbert the provost, of Lindisfarne, gave in their adhesion to the party that conformed to the usages of the Catholic Church; but Colman the Bishop and many of the monks, rather than comply, went back to Scotland, taking with them the relics of St. Aidan. Thus, after a duration of thirty years, the Columban church among the Angles came to be extinguished. Soon after, Cuthbert was appointed abbot of Lindisfarne, and zealously endeavoured to bring into uniformity with the new rule such of the brethren as still remained refractory. On the return of St. Wilfrid from Gaul, in 669, the Scots that continued to reside among the Angles gave way, or returned to their own country. Left to the administration of Wilfrid, the church of the Northumbrians was co-extensive with their kingdom, which comprehended, in the reign of Oswin, the territories of the Southern Picts, the Strathclyde Britons, and the Scots of Dalriada. After governing the monastery of Lindisfarne for twelve years, Cuthbert withdrew into greater solitude on the Farne island, at some distance from the mainland, but in 684 was drawn from his retirement to be Bishop of Lindisfarne. Two months after his consecration, King Ecgfrid was slain in battle by the Picts, the Anglic Bishop fled from his diocese on the Forth, and the dominion of the Angles over the Picts, Dalriadans, and Strathclyde Britons, civil and ecclesiastical, came to an end.

In 730 the district of Galloway, where St. Ninian had founded his church, was still in possession of the Northumbrians, and an Anglic bishopric, which endured sixty years, was here established. This, too, was displaced when the native population, taking advantage of the disorganized state of the Northumbrian kingdom, asserted their independence, and the Solway Firth again became the civil and ecclesiastical boundary.‡

* Bede, H. E., iii. 17.

† *Missus a Scottia*, Bede, iii. 25. *Infra*, Book iv. c. 4, he explains that Colman came from Iona, whither he returned. "Ad insulam Hii, unde erat ad prædicandum verbum Anglorum genti destinatus."

‡ Guilel. Malmesb. Gest. Pontif. Aug. iii. § 118.

The glory of the Columban church was now on the wane. What in times of less knowledge had been an innocent divergence from the universal Church was becoming a guilty separation, and the penalty of schism was to be paid in barrenness. The seventh century still offers some examples of missionary effort, and monks of Iona made foundations at Applecross, on Deeside in Aberdeenshire, and in Athol. But discord had entered the Family of St. Columba, and its unity was about to be broken. Adamnan the abbot, the loving biographer of his great patron, going into Northumbria on an embassy in 688, at a time when the whole kingdom was full of the memory of St. Cuthbert, the great champion of Roman conformity, became a convert to the change. Returning to his own people, he laboured to persuade them to follow his example, but failed in his endeavours, except with the Strathclyde Britons. A few years later he assisted at the Synod of Tara, and by his exhortations induced most of his Irish brethren to conform. But the monasteries in Ireland dependent on Iona still held out, and his own monks in the island refused to yield to his persuasions on his return. Before the next celebration of the controverted Easter, Adamnan died (704). "For the divine goodness so ordained it that, as he was a great lover of peace and unity, he should be taken away to everlasting life before he would be obliged on the return of Easter to have still more serious discord with those that would not follow him to the truth." Bede considered it a remarkable dispensation of the divine goodness that the same nation which had wittingly and without envy communicated to the people of the Angles the knowledge of the true Deity, should afterwards, by means of the nation of the Angles, be brought in these points on which they were defective to the rule of life.* But this uniformity was not obtained without a further struggle. On the death of Adamnan the community of Iona was divided. The larger party was for reform; the minority, giving way on some points, obstinately clung to their traditions in the main. Conflicting claims to the abbatial office complicated the schism. In 710, Nectan, king of the Picts, with his people, submitted to the new celebration of Easter; but nearly the whole of the Columban monasteries disregarded his edict, and in consequence the "Family of Iona" was driven across Drumalban and expelled the kingdom. Thus, the churches of Eastern Scotland were separated from Hii, and its supremacy over the churches and monasteries of the Picts was terminated. The conservative faction in the parent monastery was increased by the

* Bede, H. E., v. 15-32.

advent of many of the refugees, and the contest continued till 716, when Ecgbert, a holy priest from Ireland, finally induced the monks to abandon the inveterate custom of their ancestors, and embrace the Roman rites. Ecgbert, assured of their correction, "rejoiced to see the day of the Lord; he saw it and was glad."

But calamities were only beginning for Iona. The rival pretensions of strangers and the tribe of the founder to succeed to the functions of abbot were not reconciled before 772, when the community was again united under one superior. The close of the century was marked by the first of those savage descents in which the Danes, eager for spoil, ravaged the islands and coasts of Scotland. The plunder of the monasteries was the chief object of their destructive inroads. Iona was pillaged by them in 795, and again in 802, when the monastery was burned. Four years later the community, now reduced to sixty-eight members, was slaughtered. It was at this time that the body of St. Columba, for security, was removed to Ireland. In 818 the relics were brought back to hallow the site of the new monastery, somewhat removed from the place of the original structure, and better protected by its position from sudden attacks. Still the monks were not secure, and in 825 St. Blathmac suffered martyrdom in one of the attacks of the Danish pirates, to whom he refused to reveal where the rich shrine of St. Columba was concealed from their cupidity. To the descents of the Danes succeeded the ravages of the Norwegian Vikings, who first settled in the Orkneys, and afterwards spread over the western isles. The relics of St. Columba were finally removed to Ireland at the end of the ninth century; with the departure of that treasure the independence of Iona ceased, and the abbey began to be held by the Abbots of Armagh.

The Scottish dynasty, in the person of Kenneth MacAlpin, uniting the kingdoms of the Scots and Picts, the Columban church had recovered her pre-eminence over the churches and monasteries of Pictland. Its primacy, re-established and re-organized, was transferred to Dunkeld, in the heart of the new kingdom, and its abbot became the first Bishop of Fortrenn or Pictland, and the acknowledged head of the Columban monastic bodies and the Pictish church. At his death the bishopric was transferred to Abernethy, then the principal seat of the royal authority. The districts between the Forth and Spey at this time ceased to be called Pictland or Fortrenn, and became known as Alban, and their sole, or perhaps rather chief, Bishop took the same designation. In 908 King Constantine called a great assembly of his principal men to the Moothill of Scone,

where he and the Bishop Cellach solemnly swore to preserve the laws and discipline of the faith and the rights of the Church and of the Gospels. This solemn act appears to have given a final constitution to the Scottish Church. Cellach, as first Bishop of St. Andrews, transmitted the primacy, transferred now for the last time, to his successors, long called *Episcopi Albaniae*, and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the see increased constantly with the temporal authority of the kings of Scotland. The independent provinces with their several episcopates were absorbed in the dominion of the supreme sovereign, and their Bishops either altogether disappeared, or became subordinate to the Bishops of St. Andrews.

The previous period is one of great obscurity in the ecclesiastical annals of Scotland. Whatever authorities the Scottish historian who lived nearer the events may have possessed in the chartularies and muniments of the bishoprics and religious houses, we are entirely dependent for original evidence on chance references, or occasional mention of names, during the two centuries subsequent to the narratives of Bede and Adamnan. Under their faithful guidance it is possible to trace in clear outline the early vicissitudes of the Scottish Church; but they leave us when foreign invasion and domestic revolution were about to unsettle whatever organization it possessed, and no records have survived the disaster that overtook the monasteries and the reconstitution of the kingdom on a new basis.

It is impossible not to remark the absence of a regularly established hierarchy and of fixed episcopal sees during the supremacy of the Columban church. The Bishops resided where their presence for the time seemed most advantageous. In the absence of great populous centres, few places long required the continual residence of an ecclesiastical superior, whose mission in the midst of a shifting population was frequently best furthered by removal.

We come across numbers of Bishops who never appear to have had successors in the churches they ruled, and the history of most of the sees which made up the later hierarchy is formed in its first period of a series of translations. This was not peculiar to the Scottish Church, for the same frequency of migratory Bishops without fixed sees is found in the annals of other churches in their infancy.* But the special relations between the monastery and the diocese, found also in Ireland at the same period, are characteristic of the system that evangelized the two countries.

* See Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Disciplin.* P. 1, L. i. c. 45. n. 11.

Monachism may be said to have brought in Christianity; and the Faith was engrafted on the Rule, rather than the Rule on the Faith. The monastery was all in all, and the whole scheme of Church government was based upon a monastic foundation. Instead of dioceses under the jurisdiction of metropolitan and suffragan Bishops, wide districts were under the sway of different monasteries, the greater number dependent upon some leading community, like that of Armagh or Iona. It is not to be supposed, however, that there were no Bishops. Every monastic establishment of any pretension possessed one Bishop, sometimes several, within the walls; but as the Prelate was without a diocese, he was in an anomalous, and in some measure in a subordinate position. . . . As a priest, he was the ecclesiastical head of the whole community upon whom he alone could confer orders; whilst as a monk he observed the same rule as the rest of the brethren, asserting in this respect no authority over the Abbot who, as the regular Superior of the Fraternity, became in reality the leading churchman of the district.*

The case was different when the ecclesiastical system was influenced by the political institutions of the Roman Empire. When Christianity became the religion of its highly civilized and artificial society, gathered into cities, the diocese and the city were frequently conterminous and always connected. If cœnobites were introduced, their superior never assumed any but a subordinate place under the recognised head of the older hierarchy. In the Celtic church, monachism was not a feature, nor an institution, but its only organization. Secular clergy were unknown.

The expulsion of the Columbans from Pictish territory was a misfortune. The monasteries fell at once into the hands of rapacious laymen who assumed the title of Abbot, and transmitted the secularized property to their descendants by hereditary succession. The monasteries themselves did not remain vacant, but the motley band of retainers who assumed the profession of monks were a disgrace to it. The description of the condition of the former religious houses in Northumbria, left us by Bede,† probably applies equally to Scotland. Sometimes the most powerful chieftain of the neighbourhood was appointed protector or patron of the community, and then usurped the whole authority and appropriated the lands to his own use, leaving a pittance to the clergy, if these were not his own sons and relations. Sometimes the tribe of the founder claimed the succession to the abbacy in one of their members, and a flagrant instance of this abuse in the kindred Celtic church of Armagh is unsparingly denounced by St. Bernard, who com-

* Robertson, "Scotland under her Early Kings," vol. i. p. 327.

† Epistola ad Egbertum Antistitem. *Ed. Migne*, ep. ii.

plains that “nearly fifteen generations had already passed away in this villany.”

The annals of the Scottish Church continue to be veiled in obscurity till we approach the reign of Malcolm Ceanmhor. The succession of the Bishops of St. Andrews can be traced indeed without interruption, but of one or two in the eleventh century we only know the names. In 1059, Fothad the Second became Bishop. It was he who blessed the union of Malcolm with the sainted Margaret, an event fraught with the greatest consequences to the religious state of the kingdom. Winning the heart of her husband by the charm of her virtues, the holy queen soon led him to inaugurate the reform which she was to direct, to the sanctification of the Court, the remodelling of the church, and the spiritual welfare of her people. Two causes chiefly produced disorder in the church—the precarious condition of the bishoprics, and the overgrown power of the great vassals of the Crown, whose interference in ecclesiastical matters resulted in a relaxation of discipline and disregard of proper authority. Besides St. Andrews, in the dominions of King Malcolm, only two other sees, those of Candida Casa and Mortlach (afterwards Aberdeen) were at this time filled. The Isles and Orkney were not subject to the Scottish monarch. Caithness and Moray were now added, Glasgow was restored by the king’s son David in his own principality of Cumbria, and all were reconstituted on a permanent territorial basis. The queen invited from England the regular canons to replace the native cœnobites in the public worship of the cathedral churches, and the barbarous rites and peculiarities which had crept into the service were abolished. A great assembly of the chief nobles and clergy was held, in which Malcolm interpreted for the queen, ignorant as she was of the Gaelic language. Her arguments and authority induced them to sanction the changes she was bent on introducing, to bring the local usages into harmony with the discipline of the universal Church. Lent began to be observed in accordance with the Roman custom, the observance of the Sunday enforced, and certain abuses in the celebration and reception of the Eucharist suppressed.

There is, perhaps, no more beautiful character recorded in history than that of Margaret. For purity of motives, for an earnest desire to benefit the people among whom her lot was cast, for a deep sense of religion and great personal piety, for the unselfish performance of whatever duty lay before her, and for entire self-abnegation, she is unsurpassed, and the chroniclers of the time all bear testimony to her exalted character. Ordericus Vitalis says of her, in a few words—“This distinguished princess, descended from a long line of kings, was still more eminent for her great worth and the sanctity of her life;”

and the Saxon Chronicle considers that her marriage took place by divine appointment, for "the prescient Creator knew beforehand what he would have done by her; for she was to increase the praise of God in the land, and direct the king from the erroneous path and incline him, together with his people, to a better way, and suppress the evil habits which the nation had previously cultivated, as she afterwards did;" and the Chronicle sums it up by saying that "she performed many useful deeds in the land to the glory of God, and also in royal qualities bore herself well as to her was natural."—*Skene*, p. 344.

St. Margaret died in 1093. The work of reorganization commenced by her was worthily continued by her children, Alexander and David, who, on the death of their brother Edgar, succeeded, the former to the kingdom of Scotland proper and its dependencies, the latter to the earldom of Lothian and Cumbria. The see of St. Andrews became vacant in the last year of Malcolm's reign. For fourteen years no successor was appointed, the war of succession throwing all the country north of the Forth into confusion, and the conflict between the Celtic and Teutonic races making it doubtful whether the system so laboriously introduced would not be overturned. As soon as Alexander was seated on the throne he named to the bishopric of St. Andrews Turgot, the prior of Durham, who had been his own tutor, and, according to some authorities, the confessor of St. Margaret—the same who wrote her life. This appointment, coupled with a request from Alexander to have the new prelate consecrated by English Bishops, brought on the claim of York to supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Scotland. No such right was ever claimed or exercised while the succession of Scottish Bishops was kept up with native consecration. The terms of the original concession of St. Gregory had been an occasion of controversy between the English metropolitans themselves. To settle their differences, Lanfranc of Canterbury and Thomas of York agreed, in the council of Windsor, to give to York metropolitan jurisdiction over all the churches north of the Humber to the farthest limits of Scotland. In 1072 an unsuccessful attempt was made to put this arrangement in force. Plausible grounds were not wanting to support an ecclesiastical claim extending over whatever had civilly been included in the kingdom of Northumbria. After the withdrawal of the Scottish clergy Wilfrid's jurisdiction extended to the Forth, including Teviotdale and Lothian, considerable portions of the dioceses of Glasgow and St. Andrews. The subjection of Galloway to York for sixty years during the Northumbrian occupation was unquestioned. But beyond the two Friths the claim was an assumption parallel to that of civil supremacy so often urged by the English monarchs

under cover of the homage rendered by the Scottish sovereigns for possessions held by them in England.

When Alexander requested the Archbishop of York to consecrate Turgot, he refused unless his claim to the canonical obedience of the Scottish Bishops was recognised. The English king was willing to let the ceremony proceed and reserve the respective rights for future discussion, but as the Archbishop of York himself had not been yet consecrated, seeking to evade his obedience to St. Anselm of Canterbury, the latter interdicted all proceedings, and it was only on the death of Anselm that the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of St. Andrews were consecrated on the same day by the Bishop of London, in 1109. Between the king and the Bishop differences soon arose, which issued in Turgot's return to Durham, where he died in 1115. Alexander, still bent on filling the see with an English prelate who would carry out his reform of the church, but equally resolved to resist any encroachment on its liberties, this time sought to take advantage of the rivalry between the English Archbishops, and requested that Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury, should be sent to Scotland. Released from his allegiance to the English king and from his obedience to his own Archbishop, he proceeded to his diocese, where the form of election was gone through—*elegente eum clero et populo terræ et concedente rege*. He received the ring from Alexander and the crosier from the altar; but shortly after was forced to relinquish both, when it became apparent to Alexander that he had chiefly in view the subordination of the church in which he had accepted the office of Bishop to the authority of his former diocesan. Eadmer returned to Canterbury, and eighteen months' reflection brought him wiser counsels; but repentance came too late, and the king refused to accept his submission and reinstate him in the bishopric, to which he nominated Robert, Prior of Scone.

Besides the bishopric of Moray, Alexander refounded Dunkeld in 1107, endowing the cathedral and chapter from the territories of the Abbey which reverted to the Crown on the demise of his young brother Ethelred, who held them in virtue of his descent from a marriage of the lay-abbot with a daughter of the royal house. The Bishop inherited over the Columban foundations all the pre-eminence which had belonged to the Abbey, and in this way his jurisdiction extended over the whole of what subsequently became the diocese of Argyll, as well as over many disconnected parishes scattered through the eastern dioceses. Iona itself and the Isles, belonging at this time to Norway, were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Drontheim.

On his accession to the throne in 1124, David found established the sees of St. Andrews, Moray, Dunkeld, and Mortlach in his brother's dominions, while in his own principality, which now again became united to the kingdom, were the bishoprics of Glasgow, restored by himself, and Galloway, still subject to York. In 1125 the see of Mortlach was translated to Aberdeen. The remaining Columbite foundations now fell before the reforming zeal of the pious king, and on the ruins of their monasteries rose the magnificent houses of the Augustinian canons and Benedictine monks endowed with the possessions of the dispossessed anchorites. The new sees of Brechin and Dunblane were formed out of the territory of the old Pictish bishopric of Abernethy that remained after the rest had been absorbed in St. Andrews. By the erection of Ross and Caithness the number of bishoprics was raised to ten; and at the close of the century Argyll was detached from Dunkeld and formed into a separate diocese, afterwards known as Lismore. When Orkney and the Isles returned under the dominion of Scotland, the hierarchy reached its full development of thirteen episcopal sees, which it retained till the sixteenth century.

Among the Scottish Bishops, the Primacy from the time of the Picts, together with the right of consecrating the other Bishops, by custom belonged to the Bishop of St. Andrews.* But, like the Bishops of Armagh and other Irish metropolitans before 1151, he had never received the Pallium. This defect was a pretext for many vexatious pleas of the Archbishops of York against the consecration of Bishops and the meeting of provincial synods. David I. endeavoured in vain to obtain from Pope Honorius II. the archiepiscopal rank for the Bishop of St. Andrews, the opposition of York and the English influence at the Roman Court being too strong. As the Scottish ecclesiastics persistently refused to attend the councils of the English

* Bull of Alexander III. Bullar. Rom. tom. ii. lv. *Ed. Taurin.* Innocentii III. epist. 121, lib. iii. ed. Baluz. Pope Alexander III. consecrated, at Siena, 28th Nov., 1164, Bishop Ingelram of Glasgow, notwithstanding the vehement protests of the Archbishop of York, and in a Bull, addressed 24th Dec. 1170, to the Bishop of St. Andrews and the other Bishops in Scotland confirmed their ancient privileges with regard to consecrations and exemption from foreign jurisdiction. (Bullar. Rom. ii. p. 746, *ed. Taurin.*) These privileges were again confirmed by Honorius III., who, out of regard that "*Scotiana Ecclesia Sedi Apostolicæ sicut filia specialis nullo medio sit subjecta*," forbade any sentence of interdict or excommunication to be issued in Scotland except by the Roman Pontiff or his legate—providing that no one but a native of Scotland should ever exercise the office of legate, unless specially deputed by the Holy See "*de corpore suo*"—and prohibiting any ecclesiastical cause to be taken out of the kingdom except to Rome. (Theiner Vet. Mon. Hibernor. et Scotor. xviii.)

province, the Popes, who regarded themselves as the metropolitans of Scotland,* from time to time despatched legates to preside at the meetings of the clergy. The frequency of these embassies was at length felt a grievous burden, and synods came to be held but seldom. The enforcement of church discipline suffered in consequence. To remedy this state of things Honorius III., in 1225, authorized the Scottish Bishops to meet in provincial council without a metropolitan or the presence of a legate. The Bishops were not slow to avail themselves of the privilege, and in their first assembly passed several resolutions providing for an annual synod to meet for three days, and regulating the manner of its convocation with the order of business. A "Conservator Statutorum" was each year to be chosen among their own number, to whom it belonged to convoke the meeting, to preside at its deliberations, and enforce its decrees. It was not long before they practically and finally established their independence, declining to obey the summons of a Papal legate to attend him at York as an infringement of their ancient privileges, assembling a council of their own at Perth, and enacting canons of their own.

At length, in 1472, Sixtus IV. gave the right of the Pallium, with the dignity of Metropolitan of Scotland, to the Bishop of St. Andrews, assigning the other twelve Bishops as suffragans. Some of them would have been well pleased to remain immediately subject to the Holy See, and exercise in turns the office of "Conservator," as they were wont for two hundred years. His elevation drew enmity on the Primate, and whether the accusations made against him were true or mere calumnies of his enemies, he fell into disgrace both at Rome and at his own court, was deprived and died in retirement. William Sheves, his coadjutor, succeeded him: he was an astute man, foremost in the opposition to the late Archbishop. He obtained from Innocent IV. for his see a confirmation of its privileges, and the rank of "Legatus natus" in Scotland for its occupant, with rights and privileges similar to those held by the Archbishops of Canterbury.

At the request of King James IV. and the three Estates, in 1491, Innocent VIII. erected Glasgow into a metropolitan see, with Dunkeld, Dunblane, Candida Casa, and Lismore as suffragans. In 1498 Dunkeld and Dunblane were again subjected to St. Andrews, the bishopric of the Isles becoming suffragan to Glasgow.

Early as Christianity dawned, and rapid as its light spread over Northern Britain, one cannot fail to be struck by the

* Rainald, an. 1436, n. 31, apud Thomassin, l. c.

slowness of the steps by which its hierarchy advanced to normal organization. And just when, after many vicissitudes, its constitution had been developed in lordly proportions, a storm was gathering that was to overwhelm the work of Ninian and Palladius, Columba and Kentigern—and the Scottish Church of Margaret and David was swept away in the convulsions of the great apostasy. May its restoration proceed under happier auspices, and the invocation of its long-forgotten apostles prosper the work of Pius and Leo, and shield it with benedictions!

J. A. CAMPBELL.

ART. II.—THE AGE OF DANTE IN THE
FLORENTINE CHRONICLES.

1. *Dante: an Essay.* By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L.
London, 1878.
2. *Florentiner Studien.* Von PAUL BOICHORST SCHAEFFER.
Leipzig, 1874.
3. *Die Chronik des Dino Compagni.* Von CARL HEGEL.
Leipzig, 1875.
4. *Cronache Antiche Toscane.* Venezia, 1841.

THE reputation of the Dean of St. Paul's for scholarly attainments made it almost a foregone conclusion that his Essay on Dante would be a model of elegant criticism. Were the writer any other than Dr. Church, it would be matter of surprise to find mediæval Christianity treated in a spirit of reverential tenderness by a dignitary of the Church of England; yet without this temper of sympathetic tolerance no one is fit to deal with the great singer of the unseen world. It is indeed somewhat strange to observe what a tribute of half-envious admiration the uncompromising intensity of Dante's convictions extorts from an age like our own, which for itself accepts feeling as a substitute for faith, vague surmise instead of honest thought, and, alike without courage to deny, or vigour to investigate the reasonable grounds of belief, is content to face all the problems of life and futurity with the helpless inanity of a "perhaps."

As the contribution of Dean Church to Dantesque literature is principally devoted to a delicate analysis of Dante in his works, he has wisely abstained from noticing the discussion raised of late years as to the authenticity of one of the ancient

records he quotes, which the different scope of this article makes it necessary for us briefly to advert to. Modern criticism, so ruthless in sapping the foundations of history, has chosen Dino Compagni's Florentine Chronicle as the object of one of its most uncompromising assaults. This interesting relic, professedly narrating events in which the writer took a leading part, was until recently held as a standard authority; and Muratori, who first published it in 1726, considered it worthy to rank with Cæsar's Commentaries as a personal record of a stirring time. The first to impugn its authenticity was Signor Fanfani, a distinguished Italian critic, and the controversy opened by him has since been continued in the German press. It is argued, on the one side, from the late appearance of the Chronicle, the absence of early manuscript copies, and its occasional use of comparatively modern phrases, that it was produced in the fifteenth instead of the fourteenth century; while, on the other hand, it may be replied that few ancient documents are guaranteed by absolute extrinsic proof, and that the evidence of language as to their date is most fallacious, as it would presume their immunity from alteration at the hands of later transcribers. The oldest Greek texts are known to have been thus modernized by the copyists of Alexandria, and it is the task of contemporary scholarship to restore the original phraseology in accordance with that of inscriptions of the earlier date.

The discrepancies between Dino's Chronicle and that of Giovanni Villani, on which much stress is laid by the German critics, may be turned into an argument of its authenticity by the consideration that a deliberate forger would have been more likely to adhere closely to the text from which he must have compiled; while the most striking of these divergences, the omission of all mention of the Pisan war of 1293, in which the actual Dino took a prominent part, rather suggests the idea that the narrative has been mutilated, than that it is altogether apocryphal. It would seem to us that the supposition which best reconciles all these difficulties is that the manuscript, handed down in a fragmentary state, was pieced together by a later compiler with interpolations of his own, in the same way that the Chronicle of Sigonius is believed to have received large additions after his death.

But as it is not our present purpose to go into the merits of the controversy between Dino's champions and assailants, we have merely hazarded these preliminary observations to show that, if we still accept his record with others of the same date as a faithful picture of the times it relates to, we are not without some grounds to justify us in so doing. After all, our faith in

any ancient document is generally founded on internal evidence ; and the lively touches of nature in which Dino Compagni's narrative abounds, as they give it its chief value, are also the best warrant of its authenticity. Such is his complaint of the rival orator, Baldino Falconieri, "who occupied the tribune half the afternoon, though we had then the shortest days of the year ;" and this outburst of natural petulance puts us at once in sympathy with the lively chronicler, who was no doubt burning to speak himself, while the waning light was wasted in listening to his long-winded adversary. The very brevity of the passage affords in itself presumption of its genuineness, for a forger who had hit on such a clever touch could never refrain from dwelling on it, lest it should escape observation.

Dino again supplies us with an invaluable bit of life-painting, when he tells how the feuds of Florence were embittered by the tale-bearing of the jugglers, and how one of them, "Scampolino" in particular, was accused of exaggerating out of deliberate malice, and of adding a fresh sting to Corso Donati's sarcasms on his dull rival Vieri Cerchi. Here we get a glimpse into the inner life of those frowning Florentine palaces, and see how the fierce nobles, in their moments of *ennui*, hailed with delight the mischievous gossip and ridiculous antics of vagrant mountebanks.

Thus, from the very simplicity of these early chronicles we gather some idea of the social and moral influences operating in the age which they describe, though our picture of it would be but incomplete were we reduced to seek it in their pages alone. They represent it, indeed, under but one aspect, and that its darkest, leaving us in a state of bewilderment, caused by the contrast, not, as in the Renaissance epoch, between moral and intellectual—but between intellectual and social advancement.

From the picture of savage violence and lawless excesses transmitted to us by the chronicles, we turn in amazement to the sublime verse of Dante, and the marble miracle of Giotto. In a short breathing-space between barbarous civil feuds we find the Florentines founding in one year, 1293, the two great churches of Santa Maria del Fiore and Santa Croce. After reading with admiration Giovanni Villani's enumeration of the glories of Florence—of her four great schools of grammar and logic—of her thirty hospitals with a thousand beds—of her innumerable churches and monasteries—we receive a sort of shock on passing to the next sentence, in which he boasts, in the same strain of exultation, of the number of public officers who have the power of applying the torture to criminals. When Dino Compagni tells us how Guido Cavalcanti, *un giovane*

gentile, deliberately attempts to assassinate Corso Donati in the street, only failing to do so through the swerving of his horse, we ask ourselves, can this be the student and philosopher, the friend of Dante, and writer of exquisite verses breathing a spirit of contemplative tenderness? And Dante himself makes Forese Donati, in the "*Purgatorio*," utter a sentence of ferocious exultation over the death of his brother, this same Corso; while in the midst of the poet's sublime theological speculations the blessed shade of his ancestor is represented as shrinking from him in abhorrence, because his murder was still unavenged by his kinsfolk on earth.

This blending of factious turbulence and intellectual culture, not only in the same society but in the same individuals, would be inexplicable, had we no other record of the times than that which registers their civil disorders. The Middle Ages would be an enigma incapable of solution, did we not know that beside and within a society without cohesion or stability—with force for its law and violence as its principle—there existed another body, disciplined, orderly and stable, whose essence was obedience, whose strength was meekness, whose ideal, humility, whose watchword, peace. The cathedral square often, indeed, ran red with blood, but, within, the Mother and Child smiled in divine serenity from the altar. The great fortress palaces shook to the din of tumult and assault, but the campanile filled the upper air with its call to praise and prayer. The sword ruled supreme in the narrow streets, but high above the rooftops the Cross was set in heaven. Thus, while all civil authority was dead, and the reign of violence unchecked by any material obstacle, it never gained a complete moral victory. However it might seem to colour men's minds, there was, in the teaching of Christian morality, a perpetual protest against it, a perpetual vindication of a higher law; and the ark of civilization which had survived the universal deluge of ignorance and anarchy during the earlier centuries, still contained the principle of vitality that was to reanimate the world. Otherwise, the mediæval barbarism of Italy would have been hopeless as the barbarism of Central Africa, and the feuds of Florence and Bologna of as little interest to humanity as the wars of Unyoro or Uganda. But the germ of progress, though dormant, was not dead, and the subsiding of the dark waters left a living force of development behind. Thus it was that the outburst of civil fury in which Italy awoke delirious from the stupor of centuries was but the first manifestation of returning civil life, and that the convulsions of the Middle Ages were the birth-throes of the Renaissance.

Without keeping in mind that there was always this nucleus

of order in the midst of chaos, of knowledge in the depth of ignorance, of civilization in the heart of barbarism, we should be utterly bewildered by the mediæval records—by finding how, during the carnival of savage passion and ferocity described in the Florentine chronicles, art was receiving its most powerful impulse, and how amid the feuds of the Cerchi and Donati, Dante was possible. For not even Dante's genius could have produced the "Divine Comedy," unless surrounded by an atmosphere of general culture. If from the first it drew the gigantic vigour and intensity of its conceptions, it owed to the second the exquisite polish of form which fits it to satisfy the taste and defy the criticism of all time. Dante, rude and unlettered, writing for a rude and unlettered public, would still have been a great poet, but for his own age alone; and his verse, even if it survived like some rugged northern saga, as a curious relic of antiquity, could never, as now, form an integral part of the literature of Europe.

Modern thought, "the heir of all the ages," is scarcely sufficiently mindful of all it owes to the trustee of that inheritance during its own long minority; and prefers to forget that the faith it has cast off was the nurse of the infant civilization of Europe. For the sole surviving memory of society, after its long lapse of civil consciousness, was the Church which had baptized Constantine and anointed Charlemagne; and which, enthroning itself on the majestic ruins of paganism, made Rome still the centre of the civilized world, and the Latin language and literature the common inheritance of Christendom. It linked ancient and modern culture, for there was no gulf of time between classical and monastic erudition. Boethius, the heir of the Manlii, the last great disciple of the school of Rome and Athens, was still a young man when the boy Benedict fled from the world to the mountain solitude of the Apennines; and the martyrdom of the former at the hands of the Arian Goth, which may be considered the extinction of classical philosophy, preceded by but four years the foundation by the latter of the famous Abbey of Monte Cassino, the headquarters of mediæval learning.

The so-called Dark Ages had their own special form of culture—their own special goal of intellectual effort—and "the ten silent centuries" have their utterance in the works of the early Fathers. Had they been altogether mute, the mediæval world could not have burst into song in its great canticle; had their darkness not been redeemed by "the little spark hidden in the ashes," they could not have heralded the intellectual noon of the Renaissance. The object of their study was God, as that of the following epoch was man, and of later times, the visible

universe. If excessive concentration on supernatural ideas produced occasionally the exaggeration of mysticism, it at least kept man's higher nature prominently in view; while forgetfulness of it led the pure humanism of the Renaissance into unblushing cynicism, and is now dragging the daring votaries of science into the hopeless *cul de sac* of modern materialism.

The task of the earlier centuries was the amplification of the broad truths of Christianity into a system, which should meet the complicated requirements of advancing knowledge. As various forms of heresy arose to threaten the infancy of the new belief, the Church was compelled to gird herself with armour of proof, and gather about her champions capable of defending her cause in the arena of controversy. It was not, however, merely by reason of its usefulness as a defensive weapon, but also by the novelty and freshness of the ideas it called into play, that theology exercised so powerful an attraction on the greatest intellects of the first centuries. Christianity, regarded from a purely intellectual point of view, was the greatest stimulus to thought the human mind had ever received, and came to it when the vital force of classical culture was utterly spent. Apart from all enthusiasm for its dogmas, it was the most novel and interesting moral phenomenon the world then offered to the study of its inhabitants. It absorbed the thoughts even of men whose actions it failed to influence. It introduced among mankind a new intellectual ferment, and supplied the great mental excitement, even more than the great guiding principle of life. It furnished the learned with inexhaustible food for thought and discussion, and the ignorant with an endless variety of subjects for their rude attempts at spectacle or drama. It gave a fresh impulse to the human intelligence in its various grades of capacity, and developed new forms of culture adapted to all classes of minds.

For it was not by her theological teaching alone that the early Church exercised her civilizing influence, as the masses of mankind were then, as now, inaccessible to pure reason. Feeling her way, as it were, in the blind darkness of minds unreached as yet by any intellectual stirrings—blank of all ideas unconnected with visible objects—she appealed to the sole faculty by which man can realize spiritual truth, and set herself to awaken the dormant imagination, as her channel of communication with the unresponsive soul. To minds unaccustomed to dealing with abstract ideas, she addressed herself in symbols, and associated dramatic representations of her great mysteries with the celebration of their anniversaries. In

rude pictorial form, again, she depicted the scenes of the Gospel narrative, and the striking actions of the saints or martyrs, and taught by the language of visible signs those whom no other eloquence could reach. Music and dancing, too, had their part in thus educating the soul through the senses, and even the Mystery Plays, with what seems to modern feeling their profane familiarity with sacred subjects, had their uses, among people for whom written language had no existence, and spoken but a very limited range. Poetry, however, is the spontaneous voice of man's spiritual nature, as is abundantly proved by its invariable choice, among primitive peoples, of supernatural subjects; and its use by the Church as a form of imaginative culture produced those mediæval hymns, of which some—those, for example, by Jacopone da Todi—are inimitable in their exquisite pathos.

Now, Dante's majestic allegory—almost the greatest intellectual fruit of Christianity—reflects perfectly the twofold teaching of the Church in its subtleties of theological disquisition, on the one hand, and in its realistic treatment of spiritual beliefs, recalling the simplicity of popular representations, on the other. So far it is the product of the culture of the past, while it also contains the intensest personification of the spirit of its own age, and the presage of what that spirit was yet to bring forth. For into its shadowy twilight, peopled by spectres and abstractions, the human passion which was to dominate the art of the future is projected with a foreglow of anticipation; and in the introduction of the mere woman, transfigured, indeed, in celestial radiance, but still warm with living interest, the subtle change of key is already struck, which preludes the triumphant pæan of humanity. If the austere teaching of the past is personified in the shade of Virgil, and the living force of contemporary feeling in the fierce Florentine himself, the dawning Renaissance—the apotheosis of humanity—is prefigured in the mystic smile of Beatrice. For the past, indeed, was Dante's teacher, but the future was his inspiration, and all the eloquence gathered up from the dumb centuries behind him was tuned to prophetic harmony with the manifold voices of the coming time.

The rapid accomplishment of the change thus foreshadowed is shown by a glance from Beatrice, the spiritualized essence of immortal love, to Laura, the ideal woman of mere earthly passion. For while Dante and Petrarch were all but contemporaries, a great revolution in thought is compassed by the brief interval between them, and the purely natural treatment of emotion is, in the latter poet, already fully recognised as the guiding impulse of art. In another clime, indeed, and a later

age, this principle was to find its chief exponent in him who was the voice of the Renaissance as Dante of the Middle Ages, the prophet of an epoch which had definitively abandoned the supernatural in art. Shakspeare, whose Italian culture was not the least wonderful part of his many-sided nature, was the first of the world's great singers who dealt with humanity in its visible aspect alone, without any reference to another life, or a higher order of being. But the Renaissance, while thus making human nature its sole theme, never lost sight of the immaterial side of that nature, which it was left to a later age to ignore or deny. The perfect balance in which it held mind and matter was its strength, till the preponderance of the grosser element in the scale destroyed its delicate equilibrium; and the genius of Michael Angelo, the leading spirit of his age, precipitated its decline, by his final preference of muscle to mind, and abandonment of all other expression for that of mere animal force.*

This cursory glance at the spirit of the following age is necessary to understand fully Dante's position, as he stood on its threshold, alive to its awakening impulses, but still fully dominated by the ecclesiastical culture of the past. While, however, he thus embodied the intellectual teaching of the Church, his moral feeling was identical with that of the lay society in which he moved, and of which in this respect he was not a step in advance. Had he been so he would have been at once less strong and less narrow—would have sung more wisely, but scarce so well. For it is strange, though true, that the greatest minds, apart from the Saints, are never those which see most clearly and combat most vigorously the errors of their time, but those which move for good or evil, in blind sympathy with the strongest current of contemporary thought.

Now the temper of the age of Dante was that of recently converted paganism, and the Gospel, accepted without question, had as yet scarcely leavened the tone of society. The spirit of Christianity required a more gradual preparation in the mind than its dogma, and it took many ages of faith to mature, as it will many of scepticism to extirpate it among mankind. Nevertheless, even the thirteenth century had seen some striking instances of the triumph of Christian meekness; but with

* The degrading effect of materialism, conscious or unconscious, on modern art, is visible in all its productions, but is most strikingly exemplified by comparing any contemporary portrait with one by Raphael or Titian. The one is a hollow mask—the shallow and empty semblance of a man; the other portrays his whole moral nature at its best or worst.

these Dante has as little sympathy as a Homeric hero. The story of the young noble who, meeting his brother's murderer on Good Friday, by a way-side shrine, spared his life, and believed he saw the Image on the crucifix bow its head in approbation, was one of the favourite traditions of his native Florence; yet Giovanni Gualberto has no place in the poet's heaven. Filippo Benizi again, an apostle of peace in that age of violence, who travelled from town to town preaching reconciliation to the divided citizens, was an actual contemporary of Dante, and one of the most prominent figures of his time, yet his name does not occur in the "*Divine Comedy*." "*The good Marzocco*," who embraced his son's murderer and became a Franciscan friar, is mentioned indeed, but rather in a tone of patronizing contempt; while instances of the poet's sympathy with the opposite feeling might be multiplied indefinitely. His brother-in-law, Forese Donati, is even in purgatory as vindictive as Achilles; and the eternal torments of Ugolino are tempered by the gratification of eternal vengeance.

But the pagan spirit which lingers in Dante's Christian allegory comes of the rude and vigorous paganism of the German forest, not of the corrupt and decrepit worship of the gods of Rome. Long after the temples of Mars and Apollo had been consecrated in honour of the saints, and the votaries of Pan and Bacchus driven from their sylvan haunts, the golden viper was still adored in Benevento, and strange rites of northern superstition celebrated in worship of sacred trees and fountains by baptized but idolatrous warriors.* A new element had been infused into the Latin race which had a powerful influence on its development, and without which its great future would never have been. The tradition of classical culture, preserved and purified by the early Church, was the seed of the Renaissance, but it would never have fructified without the fresh layer of virgin soil with which Northern invasion reinvigorated the worn-out population of Roman Italy; like a fertilizing deluge, which, sweeping away the landmarks of the past, prepared at the same time the more precious harvest of the future.

Of all the barbarian inroads into Italy that of the Lombards in 568, as it was the last, was the most abiding. The subsequent conquest of Charlemagne subverted only the dynasty,

* San Barbato, Bishop of Benevento, uprooted in 663 the sacred tree, and abolished the worship of the viper, an image of which was kept in every house, beginning with the palace of the Duke Romualdo. It would appear, however, to have been subsequently restored, as its overthrow is again recorded in 990.

leaving untouched the established social order. This may be said to have represented the military organization of a German tribe, which, occupying the conquered country like an army encamped, had associated its various grades of authority with corresponding territorial jurisdiction. Its chiefs reigned as practically independent princes in thirty great duchies, from Friuli to Benevento, while its free-born soldiers formed the lower order of nobility, consisting of *cattani*, *valvassori*, and *valvassini*, and still classed by the chroniclers, after the lapse of centuries, as *milites* or *cavalieri*. Thus the distinction between the *Grandi*, or nobles, even though untitled and dispossessed, and the plebeian citizens of the Italian towns, was a real distinction of nationality; and the haughty aristocrats who lorded it over square and market-place, as they had formerly done over valley and mountain side, the arrogant represented self-assertion of a dominant race.

But the free-born warriors (whose long pikes or partizans, *lang-bart*, gave their name to the nation) were but a small proportion of the strength of the Lombard army, and each *arimann* was attended in the field by a number of armed retainers, who in the contingent of Narses were in the proportion of fifteen to one. These semi-servile soldiers, when settled on the conquered lands in Italy, retained their obligation of military service, and under the names, first of *aldi* or *aldiones*, and later of *gente di masnada*, formed the main strength of the turbulent nobles for private war or public rapine. Then, following their lords in their enforced residence within the city walls, they furnished those bands of domestic assassins, or *masnadieri*, who were the great pest of mediæval society.

The alien aristocracy in Italy attained its maximum of power and splendour in the eleventh century, when the House of Este ruled extensive dominions on both sides of the Alps, and Boniface, Duke and Marquis of Tuscany, the father of the great Countess, kept a Court of more than imperial magnificence.* It might have been expected that the succeeding contest between the Empire and the Papacy might have led, as the difficulties of the sovereign did elsewhere, to an increase in the power and privileges of the great vassals. But feudalism south of the Alps encountered an unexpected antagonist in that spirit of municipal independence whose sudden growth gave its history a course widely different from that which it

* The reigning dynasty of England traces its pedigree to the Lombardo-Italian nobility, as the elder branch of the House of Este, inheriting the dukedom of Bavaria in the female line, was the parent stock of the House of Hanover.

took elsewhere. This element supplied the third great principle of mediæval society in Italy, and stamped it with its most peculiar characteristic; for the traditions of the Latin Church, though nowhere else so strong, were common to the whole Christian world, while the predominance of a military caste was equally felt all over Europe. In Italy alone was the Commune strong enough to absorb into its system the infusion of barbaric vigour supplied by the Teutonic nobility.

This seems more strange in a society long paralyzed under the dead-weight of the fallen Colossus of Rome, and reduced to chaotic disintegration by the collapse of its gigantic centre. It was long, indeed, ere the benumbing effect of that terrible incubus was shaken off, and the first symptom of reaction was an extraordinary activity in local organization, and an intense development of political feeling within the narrowest limits. Amid the turbid days of anarchy, lesser centres of attraction began to emerge, round which social forces crystallized by degrees, in obedience to some new-found law of order. From the wreck of a stupendous unit were evolved a multitude of minor organizations, animated by a strong but restricted spirit of local concentration. In the monastic orders, in which the ideal of the early solitaries was developed into a community of self-sacrificing isolation, the new instinct of society found its first outlet, and in them the suppression of the individual in the corporation was fully carried out. To the same spirit Francis of Assisi appealed when he instituted his Third Order—Peter the Hermit, when he preached the First Crusade—and the thousands who took the Cross and the Cord from the one and from the other showed the irresistible force with which the idea of corporate unity electrified the masses. The lay confraternities which sprang up in hundreds throughout Italy about the same time were another phase of this movement; while it received a still stranger exemplification in the swarms of Flagellants or Penitents, who traversed Europe in a contagious delirium of self-torturing fanaticism. Jerusalem was the magnet which drew other myriads from their homes, and bands of men, women, and even helpless children, started in blind enthusiasm for the great pilgrimage; to fall victims to the hardships of the way, or, captured by pirates and kidnappers, to be sold into lifelong slavery.*

A religious motive supplies the basis of these forms of association, but the same principle is seen at work in civil

* This was the fate of thirty thousand children, who, in 1212, on their way to the Holy Land, reached Marseilles, and were there sold to the Saracens.

society, sifting and ordering its elements, and endowing them with a sense of separate consciousness. Men marshal themselves in ranks, according to community of interests, as in the trade-guilds; of pleasure, as in the societies for carnival shows and amusements; or of residence, as in the rival combinations of the inhabitants of towns, or even of different quarters of towns. Communities seem possessed by more than individual passions, while the feelings, the sufferings, the very existence of the individual, are merged in those of the community. Collective seems to take the place of separate emotion; no one voice gives utterance to the feelings of the multitude, swayed by corporate volition alone; nor can we trace to their origin in any single mind the impersonal tides of feeling which arise spontaneously from the contact of masses of men.

There is no more heroic page in history than the story of the Lombard League; but it is heroism without a hero, and we search its records in vain for the name of a single popular leader in the struggle. Milan is the protagonist, her sister cities the minor actors in the drama; and even the formidable figure of Barbarossa looms on the scene, less a personage than a personification.

Our admiration for these spirited little commonwealths in their battle against tyranny is changed into something like aversion when we turn to the next page in their annals, and find the same energy of collective passion displayed in mutual hatred, and efforts at reciprocal destruction. The first symptom of reaction from the inertia of centuries is a frenzy of civil antagonism. The early annals of these ferocious little republics are but the records of a series of duels *à outrance*, in which each persecutes its nearest neighbour with a fury of hatred only to be satisfied by its destruction. Thus Milan, after four years' hostilities, annihilates Lodi; the citizens of Pavia, in 1155, raze Tortona from its foundations; and the Romans, in 1191, leave not a stone upon a stone of their rival Tusculum, massacring most of its inhabitants, while the survivors, sheltering themselves in temporary huts made of boughs (*frasche*), gave its name and origin to the present city of Frascati.

To all this seething social life and passion of the Latin race, the Lombard nobles, living under their national law, and surrounded by hereditary retainers and clansmen, remained perfectly extraneous; but their power was insensibly undermined by it, and after the early years of the twelfth century the authority of the counts as governors of the cities is no more heard of, though that of the lords of the Marches still continues a reality. When Barbarossa crossed the Alps in 1154, to

receive the homage of his vassals in the great meadow of Roncaglia, near Piacenza, the spirit of municipal independence had made great strides; and his uncle Otho, Bishop of Frisingen, has left an interesting record of the impression made on him by the Italian commonwealths. He acknowledges that in riches and power they surpassed all other cities, but laments the insubordination to imperial authority which accompanied their material advancement, and specially singles out Milan for its uncompromising and martial spirit. He finds in the Italians the polish and elegance of the ancient Romans rather than the barbarism of their Lombard ancestors, and points out the progress of independence, in the institution of consuls, elected from the three orders of captains, valvassors, and people, and in the admission of the lowest artisans to military service or municipal office. But the main proof of the domineering spirit of the cities, indicating a great social revolution, is the fact, which he is among the first to notice, that they already compelled the nobles and magnates of their districts to reside within their walls, though free feudatories of the Empire, over whom they had no legal authority. The desire to increase their population is the motive assigned for this measure; but at least as weighty must have been that of extending their sovereignty at the expense of dangerous neighbours, and crushing a power in perpetual collision with their own. Their territory was never secure while it was hemmed in by the strongholds of a turbulent aristocracy ever ready to combine with their enemies; as did Count Guido Guerra, to mention one instance out of many, in the war between Lucca and Florence in 1154, experiencing the subsequent vengeance of the latter in the devastation of his dominions.

Still greater evils than these, however, were introduced by the compulsory residence of the nobles within the walls, as it inaugurated that second phase of mediæval anarchy scarcely less fatal than the first, when the spirit of discord which had previously impelled the cities to reciprocal aggression, inflamed one section of their inhabitants against the other, and convulsed them with intestine disorders. The animosities of rival chieftains, whose principal pastime was private war, were kept at the explosive point by perpetual enforced contact within the strict compression of municipal boundaries. A cage of untamed and newly-captured wild beasts is the image most vividly suggested by a little mediæval town in Italy, when it saw a body of fierce Teutonic nobles pent within the narrow ring of its walls, and the destructive energies that had had free scope in the German forest concentrated within the compass of a few acres. For the ruling race had kept its blood pure from

all intermixture with that of the conquered, and its spirit, little modified by Christianity or civilization, was still that of the rude warriors described by Tacitus. The household of the German chieftain in his native wilds, consisting of armed followers knowing no law but his will, was reproduced in that of the Florentine noble, whose domestic banditti followed him abroad on all occasions, and found impunity under the shelter of his roof for the crimes committed in his service. Classification by clans or families, collectively bound to avenge the wrongs and adopt the quarrels of each of their members, was the foundation of the social system of the German tribe, and the same code of honour formed the strongest moral obligation recognised by the Italian feudal magnates in the thirteenth century. Loyalty to the *consorteria*, or group of families bound together by ties of blood, however distant, was in their eyes a more sacred duty than obedience to any other precept, human or divine; and Dante gives a striking instance of the strength of this feeling, when, as we have seen, he represents the shade of his kinsman as turning from him in contempt because his death had remained unavenged. Giovanni Gualberto's act of Christian heroism was thus a protest against the strongest tradition of the order to which he belonged, and a check to the spirit which made every private quarrel a cause of discord between whole sections of the community.

The dwellings of these *consorts*, or kinsfolk, were always grouped together, and formed a series of intrenched camps, carrying on hostilities more or less active against each other. The dark palaces which still frown mutual defiance across the narrow streets of the Italian cities are standing monuments of the spirit of the proud aliens, who thus sullenly fortified themselves amid the despised burghers, making their enforced submission a new threat to the community they dared not persistently defy. A compact knot of these dwellings communicating by the roofs, or where at opposite sides of the way, by bridges thrown from window to window, formed an impregnable citadel if held by a stout garrison; and the chroniclers narrate many a siege and assault in which the inmates gallantly repulsed the attempts of the hostile faction. Their preparations for defence consisted in barricading the street (*asserragliare* or *fare il serraglio*) and bridging it with beams thrown from the first-floor windows (*fare il ponte*) so as to command the assailants from above. Their offensive operations were carried on from their terraces or flat roof-tops, as well as from their lofty towers armed with catapults, mangonels, and other engines capable of hurling formidable missiles at the neighbouring dwellings. Eccelino da Romano at the siege of

Este, in 1249, is reported to have had machines throwing projectiles of twelve hundred pounds weight, and it was a favourite pleasantry to launch a dead ass within the walls of a besieged city; so the power of mischief of these instruments, however insignificant in comparison with that of modern artillery, was not altogether contemptible. Reducing the height of the palace towers was a favourite measure of the magistrates for curtailing the power and bridling the insolence of the nobles, and enactments to this effect abound in the records of the Italian towns throughout the thirteenth century. In Florence a law was passed, in 1252, ordaining that all towers exceeding a certain limit (some had reached the extravagant height of 120 braccia) should be destroyed; and with the *débris* to which they were reduced the walls of the city beyond the Arno were in part constructed. But the spirit of discord and insubordination was too inveterate to be checked by any legislative enactment, and only the utter extirpation of the contending parties would have sufficed to stamp it out.

It would be interesting to inquire if this profound and irreconcilable split in the ranks of the Italian aristocracy, extending to every town and village in the Peninsula, and lasting unchanged for generations, can be traced to any general source, or was merely produced by the same local causes acting simultaneously, though independently. It took the form everywhere of a struggle for power, but had not the personal character which municipal competition for office usually assumes. The same clear line of demarcation is universally to be observed between the parties, which nowhere lose their identity, or break up into a confusion of minor factions. Political distinctions have a permanent and hereditary character, seldom maintained where they are based on mere questions of opinion. Abstract preference for the side of the Empire or the Church seems scarcely sufficient to account for a division of society so persistent and keenly marked, without some more radical and intrinsic principle of disunion. The chroniclers of those days are by no means given to speculation on remote causes of existing facts, which they merely record without seeking to account for them; but a few scattered hints here and there may perhaps be held to imply the existence of some such principle in a certain diversity of origin dividing the nobles into two distinct sections. The original aristocracy was, as we have seen, of exclusively Lombard descent; but a new class of feudatories of more recent creation had been intruded into its ranks. The various Frankish and German Emperors, from Charlemagne down, bestowed lands and dignities on their followers on coming into Italy, with the double object of rewarding faithful servants

and of founding their authority in the country on a firmer basis than the doubtful allegiance of the conquered race. Innumerable instances of this imperialist origin occur in the family history of the actual Italian nobility. Thus, the House of Cavour derives its German motto, *Gott will Recht*, from Albert, a Saxon follower of Barbarossa, who, after returning from the Holy Land, married the heiress of the Bensi, adopted her name, and settled in Piedmont. The history of the famous counts of Poppi illustrates the same state of things. Originally great barons of Germany, they accompanied Otho I. into Italy, where they became counts of Modigliana and lords of Ravenna, but were massacred in revenge for their cruelty, one child alone, who was out at nurse, escaping the fate of his kindred. His son, Guido Vecchio, was established in the Casentino by Otho IV., with the rank of Count Palatine of the Empire, and marrying the beautiful Gualdrada, became the ancestor of the celebrated Counts Guidi, who retained their independence for many generations. The Emperors, who spent nearly as much of their time in Italy as in Germany, would naturally look with greater favour on the courtiers endowed with lands and dignities by themselves or their ancestors, than on the older and more independent nobles, whose jealousy of the upstart imperial favourites would follow as a matter of course.

The great social feuds of Italy thus represented a natural and intelligible diversity of feeling, and the names of Guelf and Ghibelline been not mere shibboleths caught up by blind fury of faction, but symbols of the broad distinction between a national and imperialist party. Of the former, the Church—Latin by language and tradition, and by adoption if not by origin—was the obvious champion, and the authority of the Pope in matters temporal as well as spiritual, the sole counterpoise to that of Cæsar. The House whose name furnished the party with its rallying cry, and whose chiefs were its great leaders against the rival House of Swabia, belonged to the ancient Lombard aristocracy, and though partially transplanted back to Germany by its acquisition of the dukedom of Bavaria, left in the House of Este a powerful bulwark to the national party in the Peninsula. The ancestor of Eccelino da Romano, on the other hand, came into Italy under Otho III., and his descendants, true to their imperialist origin, were the principal Ghibelline leaders in Lombardy. The great feudatories, however, holding fiefs immediately of the Empire, and deriving their own authority from it, were often Ghibelline irrespective of their remote origin, and it was rather among the dispossessed nobility inhabiting the towns that jealousy of race had free play.

There we can sometimes trace it, following the obscure hints of the chroniclers who have themselves lost the clue to it.* We find, however, that they regard party policy as something inherent in the race, and inseparable from its traditions, as they speak frequently of families as "of ancient Guelf (or Ghibelline) origin," and individuals as belonging to one or other faction by birth, even when acting with the other. Thus, Giovanni Villani calls Maghinardo da Susinana "Ghibelline by nation," "*Ghibellino di sua nazione*," though at the time favouring the Guelf cause as the ally of Florence. Machiavelli applies the same term to the Cardinal Niccolo da Prato, in whose case the nationality thus referred to could only have meant remote family origin, as Prato was Guelf. And speaking of the Albizzi, he says that "many supposed them to be Ghibelline," evidently by origin, as the politics actually professed by them could not have been matter of conjecture.

In two of the leading Florentine families we find an indubitable coincidence between origin and hereditary politics, for the Uberti and the Lamberti, for generations the leaders of the Ghibelline faction, both originally bore the name of Della Magna, proof positive that they had come from that smaller portion of Imperial Germany to which the term was then applied. The patronymics, on the other hand, traceable to the older Teutonic forms are almost invariably found on the Guelf side. "Aldo" was, as we have seen, the denomination of the Lombard semi-serf, and names compounded of this word are found, almost without an exception, on the Guelf side in politics. The Aldovrandi and Aldobrandini, Monaldi, Rinaldi, and Tedaldi in Florence, are Guelfs to the last; as are the Monaldeschi in Orvieto, and the Grimaldi in Genoa; one of whom, Francesco, entering Monaco in the disguise of a friar in 1297, captured it and founded the principality which still subsists in the family. Dante's patronymic, in its primitive form Aldighieri, belongs to this category, and the family was Guelf until the poet was driven into the opposite ranks by the great split in the party at the close of the thirteenth century. Aldighieri occurs too as a Christian name, in 1271, in the Guelf family of Fontana in Ferrara, and seems identical with that of Totila's brother, Aligerno, or Aligero, whether derived directly from it, or independently from the same root. The Bardi, whose name is perhaps an abbreviation of Longobardi, were ardent Guelfs; as were the Frescobaldi, in compliment, no

* Giovanni Villani ascribes the dissensions of Florence to the difference between "the noble and virtuous Romans and the rude and warlike Fiesolans." The distinction of race is here recognised as their source.

doubt, to their descent from some ancient Teutonic warrior, whose valour merited the appellation of "Frekbald." Fresco, used as a Christian name in the House of Este, is also the corrupt Italianized version of the German adjective. The Donati, the great Guelf leaders in Florence, were originally called Calfucci, a name of not very obvious origin, but probably a corruption of some such word as "Gott-half," the Florentine *c* being an aspirate. Of this name, Buonaccorso, used as a baptismal name by the Donati, and abbreviated into Corso, would be a free translation, thus giving additional colour to the conjecture.

Roughly speaking, the names traceable to the more primitive Teutonic forms occur among Guelf families, and those referable to more modernized inflections, among Ghibelline. There are found all names compounded of the termination Berto, the Uberti, Ubertini, and Lamberti in Tuscany, the Lambertazzi in Bologna, and the Ramberti in Ferrara. The family tradition of the Colonna, the great Ghibelline partisans of Rome, ascribed their origin to the Rhine country, and their name may be derived from that of the city of Cologne. Their rivals, the Orsini, came from Spoleto, a great centre of the Lombard nobility.

But the aristocracy, from the time they were compelled to make the cities their home, seem to have renounced all wish to claim barbarian descent, as would naturally be the case when they found it their interest to ally themselves with the national party. Thus, where foreign origin is ascribed to a noble family, it is referred to Imperial Germany, and the Pannonian invaders make no figure in Italian genealogy. The Guelf partisans prefer to boast of Roman ancestry, and we find the Tornaquinci, the warlike race whose flower perished in the defence of the Carroccio at Monteaperto, thus seeking to link themselves with the patriciate of the imperial city. Their baptismal names (in those days almost as characteristic as the patronymic) betray a different origin, and we find among other ancient Teutonic forms, Tegghiajo, a corruption of the Gothic Teia, the name of Totila's brother.*

The age of Dante was an age of universal fusion; in which the elements of society, Lombard and Latin, Christian, classical, and barbarian, were combining in a series of explosions. Its strange medley of incongruities may be traced in its style

* There is a curious instance of the survival of a Gothic name among the lower classes in Florence at the present day in their use of Diomiro, a corruption of Theodemir, without any idea on their part of its origin.

of nomenclature, in which uncouth Teutonic compounds, imported by the barbarian conquerors, are seen passing in various stages of assimilation into the semi-classical idiom of Tuscany. They suggest rather the stout paganism of the Northern warriors than the devotional fervour of the ages of faith; and the baptismal register of the poet's "bel San Giovanni," would have been more appropriate to its earlier patron, the god of war, had its simple tale of black and white beans, for male and female infants respectively, recorded any other distinction than that of sex. For, instead of pious or saintly associations, we find the rude spirit of martial prowess, in names derived from epithets connected with war and the chase, or compounded of adjectives expressive of manly strength or daring. These are rendered from the original German in two different ways; by translation, and by mere imitative fidelity to sound; as in "Richowar," found in this form in some of the Latin chronicles, of which the sense is retained in "Forteguerra," the sound in "Ricovero." The former version occurs in the Donati, the latter in the Cerchi family, and its abbreviation "Ricco" thus signifies not the Latin "rich," but the German "strong."* The names of portions of armour, of birds, beasts, and even insects, as "Corazza," "Lancia," "Scimmia," "Giovenco," "Passerino," "Pino," and "Mosca," are common, and in many cases no doubt were derived from some device distinctive of the clan, as they are generally hereditary, and found respectively in particular families. The standards of the ancient Germans consisted of the heads of wild beasts borne on spears, whence came such family names as "Lupi," "Orsi," and "Orsini," who are all found on the Guelf side of politics.†

The variety of inflections to which names were subjected in the thirteenth century often makes it difficult to trace the original form, and abbreviations are the rule, not the exception. Thus, "Durante" is invariably contracted to "Dante;" "Filippo" and "Jacopo" to "Lippo" and "Lapo;" "Benvenuto" and "Arnolfo" are only found as "Nuto," and "Noffo;" "Rinieri," "Ruggieri," and "Olivieri," as "Neri," "Geri,"

* A curious instance of the same double rendering of a foreign name in Italian is found in that of Hawkwood, the English condottiere of the fifteenth century, generally given by the vocal corruption of *Aguto* or *Acuto*, but occasionally occurring also in the translated form of *Falcone in Bosco*.

† The New World owes its name to one of these Italian versions of German compounds, which may be resolved into a strange unconscious prophecy of its destiny, as *Amerigo* (in its older form *Aimerigo*), seems a corruption of *Ead—mer—rik—fortunate—greatly—powerful*.

and "Vieri;" while "Arrigo," "Guglielmo," and "Lamberto," after being prolonged by the addition of *uccio*, are finally curtailed into "Guccio," "Muccio," and "Tuccio." The same name sometimes splits up into several different forms, as "Bartolommeo" into "Baccio," "Tolomeo," and "Meo;" "Aldobrando," or "Aldobrandino," into both "Dino" and "Bindo;" while "Gherardo" is converted equally into "Gaddo" and "Duccio," and "Angelo" into "Gino" and "Giotto," through "Angiolino" and "Angiolotto."

Family names, generally only a perpetuation of these personal appellations, are equally flexible; for instance, that of "Rustico" develops into the patronymic "Rustichelli," which again in one branch of the family (that of Boccaccio) becomes "Chelli," and finally "Chellini." In the latter, could we not follow the intermediate links, we should not find it easy to trace the original root, represented only by a single letter. It seems probable that the common termination in *i* of Italian family names was originally derived, not from the plural of the vulgar tongue, which it was later taken to signify, but from the Latin genitive, implying son of. The same elliptical construction is still borne by the possessive in modern Italian, and the father's name appears appended to that of the son in official documents, in the form "Giovanni di (*son of*) Pietro." *Filius* is gradually dropped in the same way in the mediæval documents, and we find the signature "Pius Manfredi," in 1178, the Latin termination undoubtedly signifying paternity, not plurality.

Hereditary family names were not used in Italy in the eleventh century, for the Lombard chieftains living in rural state were distinguished by territorial designations, and it was only when resident in the cities that they were driven to adopt a humbler style of address. The few great nobles who retained their independence throughout the Middle Ages continued to dispense with a patronymic, and the House of Savoy is without one to the present day.

The external aspect of Florence was, in Dante's time, like its social condition, in a transition stage. The little mart of Fiesole had, indeed, expanded vastly since first the fierce mountaineers had begun to descend from their rock-hewn stronghold to barter in the plain; but the tradition of its origin kept the dwellings of its most important citizens clustered round its centres of traffic, and the Mercato Vecchio and the Mercato Nuovo were still the great nuclei of the life of the city. In the latter stood the fortified houses of the Bostichi, infamous for the private application of torture to prisoners within their walls; and near them another formidable group was formed

by the dwellings of the Cavalcanti, a warlike clan numbering sixty fighting men. The appearance of this part of the city must have differed considerably from its present aspect, as it was ravaged by the tremendous conflagration of 1304, two years after Dante's exile, in which from twelve hundred to two thousand houses were consumed by an artificial compound of the nature of Greek fire.* As wooden roofs were then much used, even accidental fires were frequent and destructive. Some of these old houses must have been stately mansions, for that of the Tosinghi in Mercato Vecchio, destroyed by the Ghibellines in 1248, at the same time as thirty-five other Guelf strongholds, is described as rising to a height of ninety braccia, surmounted by a lofty tower, and with a façade adorned with marble columns. In the same party triumph was destroyed the great tower, 120 braccia high, which commanded the end of the Corso degli Adimari; and was called "Guardamorto," because it looked towards San Giovanni, the favourite place of interment in the city.

But though party feuds were thus making havoc in Florence, much of what is now familiar in its aspect dates from the same epoch of civil strife. The palace of the podestà or Bargello, begun in 1250, was already occupied as the official residence of the magistracy; and there, where Dante's portrait still adorns the wall, he must have resided during his term of office. The Palazzo Vecchio, with that wonderful tower, whose wall, carried out on brackets, overhangs its base like a projecting cliff of masonry, was only just begun (in 1298) in the midst of an unsightly waste of ruin, where the houses of the Uberti had been destroyed by the triumphant Guelfs.

Giotto's campanile was as yet unthought of, but from the stone which the tradition of Florence still points out as the favourite resting-place of Dante, he doubtless often watched the workmen busy at the foundations of the new cathedral, and heard the ringing music of the masons' tools, as the first outlines of Santa Maria del Fiore were traced on the site of the older basilica of Santa Reparata. The work, begun in 1294, was, however, soon suspended amid the civil discords of the city, to be resumed in 1331; after which the marble mass of the Duomo rose rapidly under the patronage of the guild of wool, its cost being met by the *danaro di Dio*, collected in the factories for the great work.

Florence had in Dante's time outgrown two sets of walls, and that completed in 1078 was already superseded by the last,

* "Fuoco lavorato" it is called by the chronicler, who says it left a blue colour on the ground where it fell.

which existed until very recently. It may be conjectured that the earlier walls of Florence were not detached ramparts like those of later construction, but rather a defensive system of the compound nature, still exemplified in the villages which form so striking a feature of the mountain scenery of Italy. These little strongholds, called *castelli*, are girt by a mural ring, which forms at the same time the external wall of a continuous circuit of houses, and the bulwark of the town. It is pierced with windows in its upper portion, for the convenience of the inmates, and the gates consist of vaulted passages, generally four in number, passing under the houses like the archway of a *porte cochère*.* Through such an archway the Borgo Pinto is still reached, from what was in Dante's time 'the inner circuit of Florence, and it is probably the very postern gate by which Corso Donati forced his way into the city in 1301, finding himself baffled by the main gateway of San Piero Scheraggio close beside it. For we learn from Giovanni Villani's detailed account of this event that the old mural circuit of 1078 was not only standing, but was the chief defence of the city, and that its gates were still fortified and guarded; while the *borghi* or streets leading from them to the new walls, were either open or closed by temporary barriers called *serragli*. These Corso found no difficulty in passing, reaching in succession several of the gates of the ancient circle (*cerchie vecchie*), all of which he found closed; and it was only with the aid of his friends inside that he was able at last to break down the postern gate of the Borgo Pinto, and forced an entrance in the neighbourhood of his own houses. The new walls, thus easily passed, were probably intended originally for fiscal rather than military purposes, forming a *cinta daziara* in order to prevent the inhabitants of the *borghi*, now grown into populous suburbs outside the old gates, from escaping the burden of municipal taxation. It is at any rate certain that at this time they formed no part of the defensive works of the city, and that the strong gates which still exist must have been of later construction.

This forcible re-entry of Corso Donati had important consequences; for, once within, he was able by the connivance of Charles of Valois, then governing Florence, to drive his opponents, the White Guelfs, into that long exile in which Petrarch was

* Of similar construction must have been, in the days of St. Paul, the walls of Damascus, outside of which he was let down "from a window in a basket," which would have been impossible if they had been detached ramparts. The windows in the walls of the Italian villages are at a great height above the ground, which generally slopes precipitously from the rear of the houses.

born, and Alighieri died. The subsequent life of the latter, who was in his story as well as in his character a type of his epoch, gives us a more vivid idea than we should otherwise have had of the fate he shared with a large section of his contemporaries. Not Florence alone, but every Italian city had then a portion of its principal citizens in banishment, and their return, either by the intervention of a foreign Power, or in virtue of their own warlike prowess, was only the signal for an equal number of the opposite faction to take their turn of exile. The cry of these outcasts comes to us across the centuries in the verse of Dante, who like all poets gave a voice to what thousands mutely suffered; and we realize in his passionate complaint the homeless wandering life, the bitterness and prolonged heart-burning of the nameless and voiceless crowd, who shared his fate without his genius. Six hundred was the number of his fellow-citizens actually banished with him, no inconsiderable proportion of a population, estimated, some thirty years later, as containing twenty-five thousand men capable of bearing arms—namely, between fifteen and seventy years of age—of whom a thousand five hundred and six ranked as nobles.

The conditions of exile were not alike for all, but varied according to the circumstances of those condemned. The more powerful were generally *confinati*—that is, restricted to a given place of residence, where they might be least dangerous to the hostile Government, and most remote from their territorial possessions and rural adherents. If they broke bounds (*rompere il confine*, as it was called), they became outlaws, condemned in person and property (*nell' avere e nella persona*)—that is to say, their goods were confiscated, and they themselves, if taken, were liable to capital punishment. Their property, indeed, would seem to have been at all times administered by the Government, as we sometimes find an allowance per day made to them for their expenses, and the trusteeship of Ghibelline possessions, as well as the exclusion of the proscribed party from office, was one of the functions of the vigilance committee instituted by Charles of Valois, with the title of *magistrato di parte guelfa*.

On the mass of the less formidable exiles a simple sentence of banishment was pronounced, as in the case of Dante, who was free to wander where he chose, save within the territory of Florence. In some cases the city chosen as a refuge by these outcasts would peremptorily expel them, at a few days' notice, in consequence of some change in its policy. Thus, Dante's fellow-exiles were driven from Arezzo by Uguccone della Faggiuola, in the hope of recommending himself to the favour of the Pope. And Lucca, being defeated by the Florentines in

1263, was driven to make peace at the expense of the Guelf refugees ; who, expelled from her territory at three days' notice, had to cross the Apennines in haste and misery, to seek shelter at Bologna. At other times the banished party was strong enough to wage war against the one in power, devastating the territory, and sacking the castles and villages of their adversaries.

Before Dante's time, between 1248 and 1267, Florence had seen four of these party revolutions, and alternate proscriptions of Guelfs and Ghibellines. The former were finally restored after the defeat of Manfred at the battle of Benevento, in 1266, only however to quarrel among themselves, and split into the famous Black and White factions, represented respectively by the Donati and Cerchi. The eventual triumph of the Black party was due to the pusillanimity of the Cerchi, which threw the game into their adversaries' hands ; and the overbearing Corso Donati, Dante's enemy and brother-in-law, was able to carry all before him, and avenge on his opponents by every form of violence and oppression, the exile from which he had returned, a triumphant rebel.

In this haughty and unscrupulous noble we see a premature specimen of the Renaissance tyrant, only arrested in his career of development by the unsettled conditions of a society unripe as yet for the continuance of any permanent form, even of violence. He was wanting in the conciliatory arts, which win submission to usurped authority by masking instead of parading it, and found himself gradually superseded in power by those of his party who had the superior craft to ally themselves with the popular side. Reared in the traditions of a ruling caste, his haughty spirit could not brook even the semblance of subjection ; as we learn from the arguments with which he habitually addressed himself to the prejudices of the more violent and factious spirits he gathered round him. "These men appropriate all the honours, while we, who are by birth gentlemen and grandees, are reduced to live like strangers in our native city. They are followed by trains of armed retainers, they have on their side the false popular leaders, and divide amongst them the public treasure, of which we, as their betters, ought to be masters."

The last cry of a dominant race, whose epoch of power was passing away, could not have found clearer or more emphatic utterance. The era of the tyranny of force in which Corso had graduated was gone by, while that of the tyranny of fraud had not yet begun, and the law which he had so often defied crushed him in the end. Baffled and fugitive, after seeing his palace carried by assault, he was himself overtaken and slain by

the officers of the Republic, a mile outside the city. The monks of San Salvi buried him near the spot where he fell, and Florence was all the more tranquil for the extinction of his restless spirit.

The old order of things was indeed passing away, and Corso Donati was its last representative. The balance of power had shifted, and the democratic element was rapidly gaining the ascendant, to become in its turn an instrument of personal aggrandisement. It was thus used by a man who had all Corso's ambition, combined with a subtle genius far more dangerous than his frank insubordination, for it enabled the "Father of his country" to be at any rate the father of its rulers. Tyranny in the future must have the law as its accomplice—the masses as its associates; and princes, taking a lesson from their own flatterers, must learn to court the many in order to oppress the few. The undisguised class tyranny of the nobles was gone for ever—their position as a ruling caste undermined—and they were gradually amalgamated with their fellow-citizens, among whom they thenceforward lived as equals.

Their influence as an element of the race was more abiding, and to it Florence owes all that is most glorious in her annals. The barbarians crossed the Alps not only to destroy but to renovate, and the intellectual revival of Italy was due as much to the fresh graft of Northern vigour on the subtle intelligence of the Latin race, as to the resuscitated traditions of classical culture. The illustrious Tuscans, who have made their little country the choicest shrine of genius in Europe, belonged with scarcely an exception to the old patrician race, and stamped on all time its impress of energetic vitality. The turbulent aristocracy, whose feuds long distracted Florence, gave her also the pacific heroes whose fame is her best inheritance; and the names of Dante and Boccaccio, of Cimabue, Brunelleschi, Alberti, Da Vinci, and Buonarroti,* of Pulci, Machiavelli, and Galileo, show the value to Italy and the world of the legacy of the Lombards.

E. M. CLERKE.

* Buonarroti is probably an incorrect translation of the same Teutonic compound more accurately rendered in the name Buonconsiglio, the German *Rath* (counsel) being confounded, as the meaning of the language became lost with *Rad* (wheel), and accordingly translated *ruoto*.

ART. III.—SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON FREE WILL.

WE need hardly remind our readers that, in the philosophical series with which we are engaged, we purport to take our own humble part, in the tremendous conflict now raging between Theism and Antitheism. We are not, indeed, under the delusion, that any reasoning we can employ will exercise at once any appreciable influence. In the present state of the Antitheistic mind, we do not believe that the most irrefragably cogent adverse arguments would produce on it any immediate impression. Yet it is of vital importance, none the less, that the cause of truth be duly supported by philosophical weapons on philosophical ground. Mr. Mallock speaks admirably on this subject.

Arguments (he says) are like the seed, or like the soul, as St. Paul conceived of it, which he compares to seed. They are not quickened unless they die. As long as they remain for us in the form of arguments, they do not work. Their work begins only after a time and in secret, when they have sunk down into the memory and have been left to lie there; when the hostility and distrust they have been regarded with dies away; when unperceived they melt into the mental system, and becoming part of one's self effect a turning round of the soul. . . . Still (so Mr. Mallock continues) the immediate barrenness of much patient and careful reasoning should not make us think that it is lost labour. One way or other it will some day bear its fruit. Sometimes the intellect is the servant of the heart. At other times the heart must follow slowly upon the heels of the intellect.*

We must be content, therefore, to proceed patiently, according to our ability, with what may in some sense be called a thankless task, supporting ourselves by faith in our principles, rather than expecting to be cheered by visible result. And such is our apology, if our readers are impatient at the slowness of our movement, and at the barrenness of our labours as regards perceptible fruit. Now, therefore, to proceed.

Among all the philosophical verities which reasonably count as premisses of Theism, there are two in particular, closely correlated, on which we are disposed to lay quite exceptional stress. These are (1) the doctrine that man's will is free; and (2) the doctrine that there is a certain moral code—a certain authoritative rule of life—cognisable by reason as of

* "Is Life worth Living?" p. 241.

intrinsic obligation. These two, we say, are (to our mind) much the most important of Theistic premisses. For we heartily follow Cardinal Newman, in regarding men's natural sense of right and wrong as by far the strongest of those foundations, on which belief in God is reasonably built.* We have just now, therefore, arrived at the very heart and crisis of our argument; and every step as we proceed must be carefully made good.

For this reason—before proceeding to any further subject—we wish to establish on an entirely satisfactory basis our position of last April. To prove the existence of Free Will, we then set forth an argument, in regard to which we are not certain that it has ever been exhibited in the precise shape we gave: though we are bound to add, that the more we consider it, the more confident we are of its validity and decisiveness. Under those circumstances we cannot be surprised, that some critics have importantly misunderstood our meaning; while others, who rightly understand it, have advanced grave objections against our reasoning. We do not here refer to any published replies, but to comments which have been made in private, sometimes by way of response to our request of criticism. On our side these criticisms have shown us, that we have been by no means uniformly so full and clear as might be desired, in setting forth what we intended. It will not be necessary to pass all these objections explicitly under review, because most of them will be sufficiently answered by a clearer exposition of what we intended to say. But there are one or two, which it will be better to cite and answer in due course. Meanwhile, we have reason to believe that Dr. Bain himself, whom we criticised in April at some length, is preparing a defence in reply; which will nothowever appear for some months.

There was one particular class, then, of mental phenomena, on which we rested our whole argument for Free Will: the phenomena of what we called “anti-impulsive effort.” That which, above all things, we now desire to effect in our reader's mind is, (1) that he shall understand precisely what those phenomena are, which we call “anti-impulsive efforts;” and (2) that he shall see how entirely certain is the fact that such phenomena exist. When these two results are obtained, he will (we expect) recognise it as a very obvious and immediate inference, that the human will is free. What therefore we especially wish is, that he may observe accurately in his own mind a certain class of facts, which frequently therein occur. Accordingly we shall not hesitate to indulge, during the few following pages, in what

* F. Kleutgen also gives to this particular argument the first and most prominent place. See April, 1871, pp. 263 and 267, note.

some philosophical readers may consider a very unnecessary prolixity of detail. When any persons may have fully mastered what it is which we intend, they can easily skip over remaining illustrations. But, on the other hand, there are assuredly others, who *require* varied illustrations, in order to apprehend our meaning. In these illustrations, however, we shall purposely avoid technical terminology as much as possible. We shall not explain our technical terms by using other technical terms. On the contrary, in explaining such terms, we shall here use such language as (we think) will be most readily understood by an ordinary educated Englishman, who has received no special philosophical training.

We would beg such a person first to consider, what is the general attitude of his will throughout the day. There may be short periods, probably enough, of what we have in former articles called "vacillation and vibration." A devoted son falls in love. At various moments, then, he may go through much vacillation and vibration of will; as he is solicited by his desire of seeing the young lady on one hand, and, on the other hand, of solacing his widowed mother's old age by his company. We will not fail to take into due account these moments of vacillation and vibration. But we would begin by pointing out that, in the enormous majority of instances, such moments are comparatively rare in a man's mental history. We would point out that, during far the larger portion of most men's life, the spontaneous impulse of their will is altogether stable.

Take a most ordinary case to begin with. I am a merchant possessing regular habits of business. I rise on any given morning at my usual time; breakfast; after breakfast, at my usual time, I take a cab down to my office; when there I read the letters which I find waiting for me; at my usual time I go on 'Change and duly transact business; I meet some friends and converse with them on such topics as occur; I return to my office and attend to routine work; at my usual time I go back home again, where I have asked some friends to dinner; while waiting for the dinner hour, I amuse myself with my children; when my friends arrive, I chat with them on current topics; when they depart I go to bed. During the whole day I seem to have been doing at each moment, exactly the one thing which was natural and spontaneous for me to do. We will not here inquire, what scope there has been throughout for what we shall presently commemorate under the name of "anti-impulsive effort." But at all events there has been no vacillation or vibration of will, unless in very small matters and at very rare intervals.

Let us suppose, however, a very slight complication of cir-

cumstances. My cab is in the morning at my door, when a friend of mine pays me a visit. I have an appointment of great importance to keep, at a little distance beyond my office; and if I do not start at once I shall be too late for it. I beg my friend to get into my cab with me, but he cannot. Under these circumstances, it is possible that my will shall enter into a state of vacillation and vibration; that I shall be distracted by the two conflicting motives, of pleasure in his conversation on one side, and momentous business on the other. Let us hope, however, that my character is not so weak. And if it is *not*, the motive, which leads me to go off at once, entirely preponderates over the motive which prompts me to stay with my friend at home. The latter may be a strong motive, but the former is indefinitely stronger. Perhaps I beg my friend to give me a call next Sunday. At all events my will's spontaneous impulse remains so stable, that I have no more doubt or hesitation about starting off at once, than I had before my friend arrived.

Before I get to my office, however, another event occurs of far greater importance. Let it be supposed—in order more vividly to colour the picture—that the engagement to which I am bound is of most critical moment in my commercial life. Let it be supposed that for the last week I have been so anxious about it, that I have hardly been able to think about anything else: and that now I am intensely bent on bringing the matter to a crisis. The result is, that some symptoms befall me connected with a *heart complaint* under which I occasionally suffer. The symptom is not a painful one, nor does it interfere with my full power of transacting business. But a physician, in whom I have entire confidence, has told me, that it is simply as much as my life is worth to transact agitating business while I am afflicted with such symptoms. And in every way the circumstances are such, that if I choose to ask myself the question, I know perfectly well that returning home at once is my one right and reasonable course. Let us now consider the different ways in which my will and conduct may imaginably be affected, under the state of things we have mentioned.

Perhaps (1) the thought of this danger produces on me at once so strong an *emotional* effect of recoil, that my will's spontaneous impulse is now as stably moved towards *avoiding* the interview, as it was (a moment before) towards *encountering* it. Nay, I remember that when I get to my office, it is abundantly possible I may find *there* some agitating letters. So I at once order the cabman to drive me home again. Perhaps (2) my conduct may be the same, but the preliminaries somewhat different. The *emotional* effect, produced on me by the advent of these heart symptoms, is little or nothing. Neverthe-

less, I have so firmly established a *habit* of prudence, that (just as in the former case) the motive which prompts me to avoid the engagement preponderates absolutely, unquestioningly, triumphantly, over the motives which prompt me to keep it. Here, therefore, as in the first case, my will's spontaneous impulse is just as stably directed towards *avoiding* the interview, as it was (a moment before) towards *encountering* it. Perhaps, however (3), my will's spontaneous impulse ceases for the moment to be stable. I see plainly enough, that my one reasonable course is to decline the interview. But, then, so intense is my anxiety to bring the business matter to a point, that my *emotions* are as keenly enlisted on one side as on the other. My emotional impulse is for one instant in one direction, for the next instant in another. Then, as I have no *habit* of prudence worth mentioning, my will remains for some time in a state of vacillation and vibration. Shall I order the cabman to return, or shall I not? Shall I, at all events, go on to my office and see whether anything I find *there* may make the thing plainer? or what else shall I do? Perhaps, again (4), my will's spontaneous impulse remains unchanged. I am still unswervingly and unquestioningly bent on effecting my business transaction; though of course I am a good deal less *intensely* bent on it than I was before. On the one hand, the force of my emotions urges me most strongly to get through the matter at once, at whatever peril of death. On the other hand, my emotions (so it happens) are not keenly aroused by my knowledge of the danger which I shall incur; nor yet have I a habit of prudence sufficiently firm, to counterbalance the effect produced on my will by my current of emotion.

All these four alternatives are contemplated by the Determinist, and square most easily with his theory. But there is a fifth alternative, which he does not—and consistently with his theory cannot—admit to be a possible one. It is imaginable that I may put forth “anti-impulsive effort” on the occasion. In explaining what the phenomenon is which we designate by this term, we must begin with the beginning. We will assume, then, as first existing, such a stable spontaneous impulse of the will, as that exhibited under the *fourth* of the preceding alternatives. The spontaneous impulse of my will is still stably directed towards keeping my business appointment. On the other hand, I see clearly enough that the course, to which the impulse of my will stably solicits me, is violently unreasonable. And what we confidently maintain is this. Under such circumstances I have a real power of *resisting* my will's stable spontaneous impulse. I am not its *slave*; though neither am I in such sense its *master*, that I can at once compel

it to desist from its urgent solicitations. I can exercise "self-government" and "self-restraint." While my will's spontaneous impulse remains both stable and powerful, I can, nevertheless, refuse to do what it prompts. I see plainly the very serious evils which will befall me, if I blindly follow its solicitation. And I feel that I can act in a way, which is on the one hand accordant with *reason*, while on the other hand it is opposed to *desire* and *impulse*. However vehemently impulse may press me to the unreasonable course,—at that very moment, in the teeth of that very impulse, I can exercise what we call "anti-impulsive effort." I can put my head out of window, and tell the cabman to drive me back home again.*

For a certain period after I have done this, the two conflicting movements proceed simultaneously in my mind. I *desire* to keep my appointment, but I *resolve* that I will *not* keep it. My strongest present *desire* is on one side, my *action* is on the other. Meanwhile, however, I probably proceed to ponder on the grievous evil which would ensue, if I blindly obeyed impulse. Then, as this course of salutary meditation proceeds, my emotions become more and more enlisted on the side of reason; and perhaps, by the time I get back home, the struggle has ceased. By that time, my will's spontaneous impulse has, perhaps, come to be on the side of reason. Reviewing, however, the proximately antecedent period, what I come to see as having been its mental history is the following:—It has not at all depended on me during that period, whether my will's spontaneous impulse have been stable or vibratory; nor yet (supposing it stable) in what direction it have stably solicited me. But it has absolutely depended on me, whether I should follow the promptings of such stable impulse, or refuse to follow them; whether I should, or should not, put forth "anti-impulsive effort." If my will chose to remain passive in regard to forming its own decision,† its movement would, no doubt, be infallibly determined by the circumstances (internal and external) of the moment. But, then, my

* It can hardly be worth while to explain, that the power we claim for the agent is merely that he can *resolve* on this, if he pleases. It is abstractedly possible, that I may find myself seized by paralysis, and physically unable to put my head out of window. We insert this explanation, because of a criticism we have received. But we shall not think it worth while again to mention it.

† "Passive in regard to *forming* its own decision." Of course it is not passive as regards *executing* its decision. Suppose I yield to my spontaneous impulse, and go to the business interview. My will is active in several ways—I tell the cabman to wait for me at my office, while I am reading my letters; I tell him to drive me to the place appointed for the interview, &c. Nevertheless, my will has been passive *in regard to forming its own decision*. It has passively acquiesced in the promptings of its own spontaneous impulse.

will *need* not have remained passive in regard to forming its own decision ; it might have exerted itself actively, in decreeing what that decision should be. On myself—that is, on my soul—has depended the alternative, whether it have so exerted itself or no.

Now, were it not for the philosophical and religious issue involved, we do not believe there is any man of ordinary culture and self-observation, who would doubt that such cases occasionally occur. How *frequent* they are, is a question which, in April last, we reserved for future consideration. What we here have to point out, is merely that they are psychologically possible, and exist from time to time. I may (all will admit) be very certain of the fact, that I feel cold, or that I experience the sensation which is called a pain in my finger. But, it is just *as* simply a matter to me of unmistakable certainty (on such an occasion as we have described), that two definite mental phenomena are now simultaneously proceeding in my mind. It is a matter, we say, of unmistakable certainty, that at this moment the spontaneous *impulse* of my will is in one direction, and my *act* of will is in the opposite direction. My spontaneous *impulse* prompts me at every moment to order my cabman back to the office ; while my *act* of will at every moment energetically *resists* that impulse.

In the early part of our preceding illustration, we were pointing out how frequent a fact it is, that my will's spontaneous impulse remains stable—*i.e.*, free from all vacillation and vibration—throughout the day. We confined ourselves, however, to the mere facts of my external life : getting up ; breakfasting ; going to my office, &c. But it is worth while, for more reasons than one, to initiate a similar inquiry, as to the workings of my mind and thought. As regards *these* facts also, we suppose that with the mass of men a similar conclusion holds. My mind is probably never altogether quiescent, during any part of my waking life. But, nevertheless, with most men, one thought usually succeeds another throughout most part of the day, without any active intervention of will, according to the laws of human nature taken in connection with external circumstances. As I drive down to my office, I begin thinking what letters will probably await me there ; what business engagements I have for the day ; what is the present state of my finances ; what the state of the money market, and what hope of improvement. I remember with bitterness and disgust, how greatly this or that firm has lately stood in my way. I look at the extraordinary success of some particular scheme, which an acquaintance of mine has started. I draw attractive pictures of the amount which I, in my turn, shall realise by some ingenious speculation I have just thought of. And my fool's

paradise is only brought to an end, by the cab stopping at my office. Here, however, as we observed in a former article, one difference is to be noted, of extreme importance, between the interior and the worldly man respectively.* The difference, however, relates not to vacillation and vibration of the will, but to anti-impulsive effort. If I am happy enough to be a person steadily pursuing a course of spiritual advance, I by no means permit my mind to move unchecked along its own spontaneous course. I am keenly alive to the fact, whenever thoughts of discontent, or envy, or hatred, or undue worldly solicitude, or undue worldly hopefulness, threaten, like thorns, to choke my spiritual growth. On all such occasions—unless I am to lay up for myself matter of subsequent self-accusation—I interfere in the course of mental events with vigorous anti-impulsive effort, and fight God's battle in my soul. Then, even when nothing sinful is in my mind, I frequently interrupt the natural and spontaneous course of my thoughts, by holy aspirations, intercessory prayers, theological acts. Not unfrequently, of course—in virtue of my pious habits—such acts present themselves spontaneously, in accordance with the natural workings of my mind. But at other times I introduce them by anti-impulsive effort; when my mind is naturally moving in a different direction, and when its spontaneous impulse is stably opposed to these holy occupations.

We hope by this time we have made clear to our readers, what that compound phenomenon is, to which we beg their careful attention. Two mutually related acts are simultaneously proceeding in my mind. The first of these acts is my will's stable spontaneous preponderating impulse, in one given direction. The second of these acts is my firm and successful resolution to resist that impulse, and proceed in a different—perhaps the opposite—direction. In our Article of last April we gave another illustration of our point, which (we think) will bear repeating. A military officer—possessing real piety and steadfastly purposing to grow therein—receives at the hand of a brother officer some stinging and (as the world

* "A similar remark may be made," we pointed out, "on numberless other instances, where men agree with each other, as a matter of course, in doing the external act, but differ indefinitely as to the spirit in which they do it. It is really difficult to determine how often the good man's probation consists—not in the external act which he has to do—but in the motives for which he does it. During the greater portion of his life his growth in virtue mainly depends either (1) on his choice of good motives for everyday acts; or (2) on acts altogether interior, such as patience, self-examination, humility, forgivingness, equitableness of judgment, purity, under circumstances of trial."—April, 1874, p. 354.

would say) intolerable insult. His nature flames forth ; his preponderating spontaneous impulse—his strongest present desire—is to inflict some retaliation, which shall at least deliver him from the reproach of cowardice. Nevertheless, it is his firm resolve, by God's grace, to comport himself Christianly. His *resolve* contends vigorously against his strongest present *desire*. He exercises continuous self-restraint and self-control. He puts forth unintermittingly intense anti-impulsive effort. What *inference* may justly be drawn from this class of (what we have called) compound mental phenomena—is a question on which we shall speedily enter. At present all we wish is, that our reader may understand how certain is the *existence* of these phenomena.

In the illustrations which we have hitherto given, what is the characteristic which will have impressed our reader, as specially distinguishing “anti-impulsive efforts” from those other mental acts with which we have contrasted them? Perhaps this, that they involve constant *struggle* and *effort*. But it is of vital importance for our argument to make it clearly understood, that there are very many acts, involving great struggle and effort, but which, nevertheless, are not acts of *anti-impulsive* effort. Acts of anti-impulsive effort are one thing ; acts of what we call “congenial” effort are quite another thing. Acts of *congenial* effort are those done in *accordance* with my strongest present desire ; in accordance with the stable and preponderating spontaneous impulse of my will. Acts of *anti-impulsive* effort, on the contrary, are acts done in *resistance* to such desire and impulse. As an instance of “congenial” effort, we referred in April last to a gallant soldier in action. He will very often put forth intense effort ; brave appalling perils ; confront the risk of an agonizing death. But to what end is this effort directed ? He puts it forth, in order that he may act in full accordance with his preponderating spontaneous impulse ; in order that he may gratify what is his strongest present desire ; in order that he may defend his country, overcome his country's foe, obtain fame and distinction, gratify his military ardour. In cases of *anti-impulsive* effort, the agent practices “self-restraint and self-control.” But most certainly no one would commemorate the “self-restraint” of one, who should be so carried away (breathlessly, as it were) by military ardour, by desire of victory, by zeal for his country's cause, by a certain savage aggressiveness—who should be so carried away (we repeat) by these and similar impulses, that (under such influences) he performs prodigies of valour. In seeking to gratify these overwhelming and sovereign desires, he tramples under foot an indefinite number of those weaker wishes which have just now no such hold

on his will. He faces appalling dangers without one pause for deliberation or reflection, because his overmastering crave of the moment intensely impels him so to act. If our readers would carry with them a clear notion of the contrast which we intend, between "anti-impulsive effort" on one side, and "congenial effort" on the other,—they cannot (we think) have a better guide, than to keep in mind these two distinct courses of action, pursued by the same brave and gallant soldier. Let them first consider him, on the one hand, as he puts forth intense struggle for victory in the heat of action. Then let them consider him, on the other hand, as putting forth struggle no less intense—the struggle of self-restraint and self-control—in order to exercise full Christian patience and meekness under insult and humiliation.

On a former occasion (July, 1874, p. 166) we have entirely admitted, that there may be sometimes difficulty in deciding whether this or that given effort be "congenial" or "anti-impulsive." But these, we added, will always be instances belonging to what may be called the border-land; cases in which the influences acting on me are so nearly equivalent, that it requires very careful self-inspection on my part to see on which side the balance preponderates. But if there are extreme cases—where it is not easy to be certain in which direction lies the preponderating impulse—the great majority of cases are quite different in character. By far the greater number of "anti-impulsive efforts" are of such character, that no one possessing the most ordinary power of self-inspection can possibly doubt their being what they are. And as, hitherto, we have given fewer instances of what we call "congenial effort" than of any other phenomenal class with which our argument is concerned, we will conclude this particular part of our subject by giving two more instances of what we mean by this last term. By doing this we shall make still clearer how radical is the distinction between "congenial" and "anti-impulsive" efforts respectively.

First, let us go back to our merchant seized with heart symptoms. One probable alternative with him is, that his preponderating spontaneous impulse (whether in consequence of predominant emotion or of confirmed prudential habit) prompts him vigorously to going back home. Nevertheless, there is a strong emotional current, setting in the *opposite* direction. He puts forth much effort and struggle to *resist* this emotional current. True, but such effort is "congenial," and proves nothing against Determinism. The effort is *prompted*—not *opposed*—by his preponderating spontaneous impulse.

Second illustration. I am at sea in a pleasure-boat, when to

my dismay I discover plain signs of a rapidly approaching storm. I at once set to work at rowing towards shore for the sake of dear life. The effort which I put forth is intense. I vigorously, continuously, energetically, unflaggingly resist every antagonistic desire. But in which direction (all this time) is my *desire*—my *strongest* present desire? my stable spontaneous *impulse*? my natural *tendency*? Of course, in the very same direction with my *act*. Contrast this with my state of mind when, for Christ's sake, I strenuously resisted my desire of retaliating injury. In that earlier case, my effort was put forth in order that I might *oppose* the predominant desire, impulse, and tendency of my will. But in the present case they are put forth, in order that I may *gratify* that desire; that I may obey more *thoroughly* that impulse; that I may give fuller and freer *scope* to that tendency. In the earlier case my efforts were directed to an end, from which the spontaneous impulse of my will recoiled; whereas they are now directed to an end, which my will (according to its spontaneous impulse) intensely desires. In the earlier case my will put forth vehement effort, in order to resist its own urgent tendency; *now* it puts forth such effort, in order to give that tendency its freest and most unfettered play. In the earlier case I exercised unremitting, energetic, vigilant "self-government" and "self-control." But it would be droll enough to hear any one say that a man exhibited "self-government" and "self-control," by the mere fact of straining every nerve to escape a watery grave.

Here, then, we close the first portion of our Article. By means of these multiplied and diversified illustrations, we trust we have made clear to our reader what we wished to make clear. We hope he will now (1) understand what we *mean* by "anti-impulsive effort;" and (2) see that acts of such effort do really from time to time take place in the human mind. Our next task, then, will be to exhibit the argument, deducible from these acts in favour of Free Will. It may be remembered that, during the larger portion of our preceding Articles on this subject, we were merely arguing for "Indeterminism"—*i.e.*, for the negative doctrine, that the doctrine of Determinism is false. It was not until we reached the later portion of our last Article (April, 1879), that we argued for the full doctrine of Free Will. Here we will, therefore, refer respectively to these two stages of our reasoning.

The mental facts, on which we directly based that reasoning, are (as we have so often said) those of "anti-impulsive effort." In every case of this kind, there exists what we have called a "compound phenomenon;" or, in other words, there co-exist in my mind two mutually distinct phenomena. First

phenomenon. My will's preponderating spontaneous impulse is stably set in one given direction. Second phenomenon. My will *resists* that preponderating spontaneous impulse, and I act in a different—often an entirely opposite—direction. To fix the fact in our mind more definitely, let us recur to the merchant who, on being seized with recognised symptoms of heart complaint, acts reasonably, but very much against the grain, by telling the cabman to drive him home again. He is acting, by supposition, very much *against the grain*. One distinctly-pronounced and strongly-marked mental phenomenon is his restless, impatient, and predominant desire to bring this very troublesome business matter to a conclusion. So strong is the predominance of this desire, that—unless he exercised unintermitting self-resistance, self-government, self-control—he would infallibly countermand his recent order, and direct the cabman back to his office. Here is one unmistakable phenomenon. A second, no less distinctly-pronounced and strongly-marked, phenomenon, is this very self-resistance, self-government, self-control, of which we have been just speaking. On one side is that phenomenon, which we call his will's predominant spontaneous *impulse*; on the other is that phenomenon, which we call its firm and sustained *resolve*.

Now, firstly, let us set forth the *negative* argument which we deduce from such mental facts—the argument directed merely to show, that the doctrine of Determinism is false. We drew this out at length in July, 1874, pp. 170–172, and will here very briefly sum up what we there said. The doctrine of Determinists is precisely this: that my will's action at any given moment is infallibly determined, by the preponderant influences and attractions of that moment. Now, during the greater part of my waking life, my consciousness directly testifies what *is* that course of conduct, to which the preponderant influences and attractions of the moment dispose me. For my will's *spontaneous impulse* directly supplies me with such testification. My will's spontaneous impulse, we say, whenever it is stable, precisely testifies what is that course of conduct, to which my preponderant desires and attractions of the moment dispose me. But, as we have been urging at such length, it is an undeniable fact of experience that at certain periods I pursue a course of conduct, *divergent* from that prompted by my will's spontaneous impulse. It is most clear then that, at those particular periods (be they more or fewer), my will is *not* infallibly determined by the preponderant influences and attractions of the moment. In other words, the phenomena of those periods make it irrefragably certain, that the doctrine of Determinism is false.

But we now proceed, from the negative argument disproving

Determinism, to the positive argument establishing Free Will. And this, we maintain, is even more direct and immediate than the former. We solicit for it our readers' careful attention, because we feel that we did not state it last April with sufficient prominence and emphasis. Consider respectively those two distinct phenomena—preponderating spontaneous impulse on one side, anti-impulsive effort on the other side,—to which we have so earnestly drawn attention. If we examine them successively with due care, we shall see that they differ from each other in character not less than fundamentally. In experiencing one of them, my will is entirely passive; in experiencing the other, it is intensely active.* Consider my will's spontaneous impulse; the impulse, *e.g.*, which prompts me to bid the cabman drive me back to my office. In experiencing this impulse, my will (we say) has been entirely passive; the impulse has *befallen* me, *come upon* me, *taken hold* of me: such are the phrases which I should naturally use. On the other hand, my *resistance* to this impulse has been not merely *experienced* by my soul, but has rather been put forth by my soul's *intrinsic strength*. I am not only conscious that I *elicit* the act of resistance; I am no one whit less directly conscious that I elicit it *by the active exertion of my soul*. The consciousness of one single moment suffices to show me unmistakably, that I have the power at that moment of resisting preponderant impulse by my soul's intrinsic strength. I know unmistakably that I have the power to do this, because I know unmistakably that I am actually doing it.

So important is the doctrine, which may reasonably be based on the consciousness of one moment. But we need hardly add that still more important inferences may be drawn, if we contemplate the experience, not of one moment only, but of a continuous period. This we urged last April. The experience which I obtain, even in one single period of protracted and vehement struggle against impulse, is amply sufficient to give me an intimate and infallible knowledge of one all-important fact. We refer to the fact that, at every moment of the struggle, it has depended simply on my own choice, with what degree of efficacy I have struggled against the temptation.

* So Mr. H. W. Lucas (*The Month* of February, 1878, p. 251) distinguishes emphatically between "what has *been given to me*" and "what *proceeds from me*;" between "what I *have*" and "what I *do*." And, again (p. 254), "I deny entirely that, in resisting a temptation, I am the mere passive spectator of a battle between conflicting impulses. . . . I know what it is to witness the succession of my thoughts, to feel their solicitations: and I know, on the other hand, what it is to exert myself to govern that succession of thoughts and resist the solicitations. In the one case I am a spectator, in the other an actor."

It will be admitted by every philosopher—be he Libertarian or Determinist—that such a power as we have just described, is the very power which every one designates by the name “Free Will.” It is this very power, of which Libertarians maintain, and Determinists deny, the existence. In April last (pp. 316-320) we proceeded to show this in some detail; and we need not here repeat what we there said. There is, no doubt, a very important supplementary question—viz., during how many moments of the day, in what acts, under what conditions, do I *possess* the power of acting freely? But of this question—while earnestly expatiating on its importance—we postponed our treatment to a somewhat later portion of our course.

Still there are two further matters of philosophical doctrine, which it will be necessary to consider even on the present occasion, previously to our leaving this part of our subject. The first of these has very little comparative importance, and what we have to say on it in no way affects our argument on one side or the other. Still we must explain ourselves, in order to avoid the possibility of our being misunderstood on one subordinate point. In our whole discussion, then, we have put entirely into the background any consideration of those exceptional moments, during which there exists what we have called vacillation and vibration of the will. We have founded our whole argument on those other indefinitely more frequent instances, in which the will's preponderating spontaneous impulse is entirely stable. We have done this, because it is instances of *the latter* kind, which so unmistakably exhibit that phenomenon of anti-impulsive effort, on which our whole reasoning has depended. But, at the same time, we must not for a moment be supposed to admit that the will is not *free*, even during a period of vacillation and vibration. On the contrary—as we mentioned in April, 1874, p. 340—we are confident that by no means unfrequently (though, we admit, by no means universally) vacillation and vibration are simply *caused* by freedom. The will first languidly and falteringly resists its own spontaneous impulse, and then (for want of due energy) sinks back into acquiescence. Then another languid effort probably succeeds, to be again followed by relapse. And this kind of movement may go on for a considerable period of time. We are not here, of course, *arguing* for this conclusion: such an argument is not yet in place. But it has been necessary to make this explanation, as our reasoning might otherwise be importantly misapprehended.

The other matter of philosophical doctrine to which we just now referred, is one which we have discussed, indeed, on earlier occasions, but to which we must once more recur.

We wish our readers expressly to observe that, in dealing with "spontaneous impulse," there are two questions entirely distinct from each other, which are sometimes inadvertently confused to the great detriment of philosophical lucidity. It will be admitted by every one that, during far the longer portion of my waking life, my will is affected at every successive moment by some stable preponderating spontaneous impulse. Again, it will also be admitted (we suppose) universally, that this stable preponderating spontaneous impulse is infallibly determined at each moment by my *circumstances* of that moment, internal and external. These two statements being accepted and taken as our foundation, there are two entirely distinct questions (we say) which are introduced by them.

The first of these questions is that, on which we have been mainly labouring in the present and previous Articles. Is this spontaneous impulse infallibly and necessarily followed by accordant action? Or, on the contrary, have I the power of resisting it, and acting in a different direction? We have argued earnestly (we need hardly say) for the *latter* of these alternatives. And we shall here, of course, assume that we have argued successfully.

But there is a second question,—entirely irrelevant, indeed, to the Deterministic controversy,—yet undoubtedly of great philosophical importance. Nor, indeed, can we ourselves escape the necessity of saying a word or two concerning it; because its consideration is involved in the answer we must give, to one particular objection which has been urged against our reasoning. The question may be thus stated. My will's preponderant spontaneous impulse at any given moment is infallibly determined (we have said) by the circumstances, internal and external, of that moment. We proceed to ask, by *what* circumstances? Among all the co-existing circumstances of the moment, which are those that influence the will's impulse? And this being known, further in what mutual *proportion* do they influence it? Or let us put the same question in other terms. Of co-existing circumstances, (1) which are those that are factors of my will's impulse? and (2) with what *proportionate* degree of *efficacy* do these respective factors act on it? This question—our readers see at once—is a very comprehensive one; but there is only one particular part of it, on which our purpose requires us to lay prominent stress. We ask, then, more particularly—what are the mutual relations of *habit* on one side and *emotion* on the other, in determining the will's spontaneous impulse? Determinists sometimes express themselves incautiously, as though they thought that the mere balance of *emotional craving* determines the impulse. But we suppose they cannot really mean this; most certainly Dr.

Bain does not mean it. In April, 1874 (pp. 327-333), we set forth his theory on the subject, as far as we were able to understand it; and proceeded to express our own substantial agreement therewith. We dissent, of course, intensely from his opinion, that the will's spontaneous impulse infallibly issues in accordant *action*; but we are disposed substantially to agree with what he says, concerning the *genesis* of that impulse. We do not mean that he has even come near to fathoming and exhausting the subject; for it is one which (we think) has been most unduly neglected by psychologists. But Dr. Bain has gone much further into it than any other philosopher with whom we happen to be acquainted; and we substantially agree with all which he has said thereupon.

Our own concern, however (as we have already said), is only with a small part of a very large theory. On earlier occasions we have protested against any such notion, as that the will's spontaneous impulse is always determined by the mere balance of emotional craving. And as we find, from certain criticisms which we have received, that we have been misunderstood on this point,—we will here repeat what we have said in former Articles. Certainly it is a most shallow view to suppose, that the will's spontaneous impulse at any given moment is determined by the mere balance of emotional craving and excitement at that moment. *Habits* of the will are also most important factors of the result. Suppose, *e.g.*, I have acquired a firm habit of rising at some particular time in the morning. When that hour arrives, nothing is more probable than that the balance of my emotional craving is towards remaining in bed. But it results from my acquired habit of early rising, that the confused thought of all those various benefits which result from the practice of early rising—that this confused thought spontaneously resists the stream of emotion. This confused thought (we say) of future advantage so effectively influences my will, that my spontaneous impulse is towards rising. In this case, the desire engendered by habit is a more influential desire, than that engendered by emotional craving; and I rise from bed, as a matter of course, without the need of any anti-impulsive effort. What effort there is—and perhaps a good deal may be exercised—is, nevertheless, entirely “congenial” effort.* A few pages back we made a similar supposition, when considering our old friend, the merchant seized with heart symptoms. One among the alternatives which we supposed—and one by no means uncommon in such a case—

* We have fully admitted (our readers will remember) that there are not a few instances in which it may be reasonably doubted, whether some given act be one of “congenial” or “anti-impulsive” effort. But we have made it (we trust) abundantly clear that there is a much larger number of instances in which there cannot reasonably be any such doubt.

was this. We supposed that—in virtue of his firmly acquired habit of prudence—habit prevailed against emotion. His desire of avoiding the peril which his business interview would cause, was indefinitely more influential, than his antagonistic desire of terminating his long anxiety at once by *proceeding* to the interview. The latter desire might be accompanied with much stronger emotional excitement; but habit on this occasion was stronger than emotion, and his will's spontaneous impulse prompted his return home. Often enough, then, habit spontaneously prevails against emotion; often, on the other hand, emotion spontaneously prevails against habit. We will not here attempt any psychological analysis of either phenomenon. We will only repeat the remark which we have already made—viz., that psychologists have (in our humble opinion) been very unduly remiss in exploring the matter scientifically.

Here, then, our remarks incidentally offer a very convenient point of transition, to the next portion of our task. This next portion is the giving a brief explanation of certain technical terms, which we have used in preceding Articles, and which some of our critics have failed rightly to apprehend.

Firstly, then, when we speak of desire A being “stronger” than desire B, we are far from meaning necessarily to say, that A is accompanied by a stronger *emotional craving* than B. We mean that A has more influence than B on the will's spontaneous impulse. It follows, therefore, that—according to our use of words—“my strongest present desire at this moment” means neither more nor less than “my will's spontaneous impulse at this moment.”

Further. By the term “effort” we mean “resistance to desire.” “Congenial effort” is “resistance spontaneously offered to some (at the moment) weaker desire, in order to the gratification of some (at the moment) stronger desire.” “Anti-impulsive effort” is “resistance offered by my will's intrinsic energy to my strongest present desire, for the purpose of advancing towards some end, which my intellect proposes to me (at the moment) as worth my so aiming at.”

Once more. Inducements influencing the will are evidently of two fundamentally different kinds, accordingly as they respectively influence (1) its spontaneous impulse, or (2) its active exertion in *resisting* impulse. Since, therefore, they are of two essentially different kinds, we have thought it important to give them distinct names. So far as my will's spontaneous impulse is concerned—our readers have seen, that my will has had no active part whatever, has put forth no intrinsic energy whatever of its own, towards the origination of that impulse. The various circumstances, therefore, which have combined to

originate it, may well be paralleled to those physical attractions, which at any given moment solicit some inanimate particle. Accordingly, we have called such influential circumstances by the name of "attractions." Moreover, we have divided them into "emotional" and "non-emotional" attractions. The latter term we apply to those cases—just now considered by us—in which the desire is not mainly *emotional*. Take, *e.g.*, the thought of those confusedly remembered advantages, which result from the practice of early rising. This thought will be very powerfully influential, if a strong habit have been acquired in the appropriate direction; but its attractive efficacy is not exercised mainly through the medium of *emotion*.*

So much as regards those influences, which act more or less powerfully on the will's spontaneous impulse. We have called these "attractions;" and we have reserved the term "motives" for a different kind of influence altogether. On this matter we would refer our readers to our Article of April, 1874 (p. 336); and we will here add a few words on the broad contrast which exists between "attractions" and "motives." Firstly, the word "attraction" may perhaps be suitably so extended, as to include other influences besides *thoughts*. If I pass a gentleman's park which is open to the public, so delightful a scent of flowers may reach me, as to produce a certain influence (whether predominant or no) on my will's spontaneous impulse, prompting me to turn aside and enter the park. This scent may, perhaps, suitably be called an "attraction." But, putting this consideration aside, and supposing it were agreed that the term "attraction" should be confined to attracting *thoughts*—even so the distinction is signal, between "attractions" and "motives." Those thoughts which we call "attractions" occur to my mind without any active intervention of the will, according to the spontaneous working of psychical and physical laws. And these laws, moreover, infallibly determine, what is the amount of influence which such attractions shall exercise on my will's spontaneous impulse. But a "motive" is the thought of such or such an end, which the will by its own active resolve chooses to pursue.† Moreover, these thoughts remain in my mind, not mainly through the spontaneous working of psychical and physical laws, but (far more) by the will's own anti-impulsive effort. My will fixes my attention on those thoughts,—in opposition to the preponderating impulse which may

* We have spoken of these "non-emotional attractions" in April, 1874, pp. 330, 331; pp. 331, 332, Note; pp. 342, 343; in July, 1874, p. 68.

† Mr. H. W. Lucas defines "motive" much as we do. "A motive I understand to be the apprehension of an end" (April, 1878, p. 501).

prompt me to think about something else,—in order that I may more vigorously pursue the end which they indicate. At the same time we are, of course, as far as possible from forgetting, that those very thoughts, which my will's anti-impulsive effort selects as "motives," far more commonly than not (while present in my mind) are also "attractions;" and affect in greater or less degree my will's spontaneous impulse.

We are now, at last, in a position to examine those few among the friendly criticisms received by us, which seem to need distinct consideration.

I. One critic (unknown to us, but evidently a Catholic) thus comments on our fundamental argument.

A Determinist might say [in reply to that argument], "If the soul has been furnished by education with moral habits of some considerable strength, they would be the proximate cause of a resistance to the strongest present desire. That is to say, the strongest present desire would fail in its effect, because of a motive-power existing in the soul."

Now, if our critic means, by a "motive power of the soul," a power residing in my soul of putting forth anti-impulsive effort at my free choice, he and we are here entirely at one. But it is plain (we think) that he means something quite different. He has apparently understood us to use the term "my strongest present desire," as synonymous with "my strongest present emotional craving." But we think that the reference we have made in past Articles to "non-emotional attractions," ought sufficiently to have averted such misapprehension. At all events we have made our meaning abundantly clear on the present occasion. We are the very last to forget, that "moral habits of considerable strength" preponderate again and again over emotion, in the influence exercised by them on my will's spontaneous impulse. But the question on which our fundamental argument turns, is not how that impulse is *engendered* or *influenced*. Our sole essential question is whether that impulse (however engendered) be ever resisted.

We do not at all deny—on the contrary, in April (p. 303) we expressly maintained—that moral habits are of great service not only in elevating the will's spontaneous impulse, but also in facilitating anti-impulsive effort. But we have given our reasons for holding that any act of true anti-impulsive effort, however much it may be facilitated by habit, is nevertheless a conclusive proof of Free Will.

II. In this first objection, then (so we submit), the writer has failed to apprehend our precise argument. His second objection, however, is indubitably relevant, and we must simply

fight the matter out with him. He would, himself, he says, be prepared to "acknowledge that the will is a *cæca potestas*; that it cannot act without a motive, and that, therefore, it cannot resist its strongest present desire, while that desire is held before it." But, then, he would maintain against Determinists, that the will "has full power to *turn to other motives*;" and he says that this latter power, at all events, can be easily proved to exist. In this last statement, of course, we entirely agree; the question is, whether a much stronger power of resistance to "motives" cannot also be established.

Putting the statement into our own language, what we understand our able and intelligent critic to maintain is this:—"So long as my will's spontaneous impulse is in one direction, I have not the power of acting in an opposite direction. I have no further immediate power of resistance, beyond that of turning my attention to opposite inducements; and of otherwise suspending my action, until the thought of those inducements—acting by way of attraction—shall have diverted my spontaneous impulse into the direction which I desire." We are well aware that many thoughtful Catholic philosophers take this view; but (with sincere respect for their authority) we cannot ourselves see reason to accept it. Let us go back to our old illustration of the merchant seized with heart symptoms, who at once by anti-impulsive effort resolves to return home, though very much against the grain. Under such circumstances—as soon as I have had a moment for reflection after experiencing those symptoms—I order my cabman to take me back home. My preponderating spontaneous impulse—my strongest present desire—is directed vigorously and intensely towards going on to my office. But by strong anti-impulsive effort I resolve to order my cabman back again. It is not merely, that I begin to ponder on other "motives;" but that, without waiting for any change of my spontaneous impulse, I perform the critical bodily act, of putting my head out of window and turning the cabman back. Our critic on the contrary must say, that such an act on my part is impossible according to the laws of human nature. Here, then, precisely is the question which inquirers have to consider. According to the constitution of the human mind—have I, or have I not, the power of ordering my cab home again, at a moment when my will's spontaneous impulse still prompts me in an opposite direction? Those who consider that such conduct as we have described is psychologically impossible, will be on our friendly opponent's side; those who think it entirely possible, will be on our side. We cannot fancy that, when this

alternative is fairly placed before minds unwarped by theory, there will be much doubt on the response.*

Perhaps here we shall make our precise point still clearer, and show also how much we can concede to our opponent, if we have recourse to another illustration of anti-impulsive effort. I have asked to be called at a somewhat early hour, in order that I may visit a sick dependent, whom I could not otherwise have time to see. At the moment of being called, so far am I from springing up with promptitude, that, on the contrary, my will's spontaneous impulse—not merely its emotional craving, but its spontaneous impulse on the whole,—is intensely averse from rising. As soon, however, as I have time to collect my energies, I freely exercise with some vigour the power I possess, of resisting my strongest present desire. The effort which I have made indeed is not sufficient to *counter-balance* my spontaneous impulse, and I still therefore remain in bed. What then will be my state of will, immediately after this first moment of effort? The spontaneous impulse of my will, in the direction of staying in bed, has immediately become importantly weaker than it was just before; weaker by the whole extent of force corresponding with the effort I have made. Or to put the matter algebraically, "My new spontaneous impulse towards staying in bed" equals "my old spontaneous impulse towards staying in bed," minus "the force freely exercised by my will in the opposite direction."

But this first free act of my will produces by degrees a *further* effect also on my spontaneous impulse, entirely distinct from that which we have just mentioned. The motive of my anti-impulsive effort was the thought of a certain benevolent action, for which I should lose my opportunity if I went to sleep again. Consequently, during my effort, I have fixed my thoughts on this. But the thought of this visit is to me a very attractive thought; whether by way of emotion, or

* We can here cite Mr. H. W. Lucas in corroboration. These are his words:—He refers to "an assertion which has been made by some of the modern advocates of Free Will, and which, with all respect to those who maintain it, strikes me as psychologically untrue, and therefore damaging to the cause of Free Will. We may (it is sometimes said) concede to Determinists that the will always follows the strongest motive, provided we observe that the will has power to strengthen the motive on which it elects to act. Now, such a statement makes the will free only in the selection of motives. But the question at once arises—Is, then, the will motiveless in making this selection? Surely, in selecting, the will must be influenced by reasons pro and contra, else its actions were indeliberate; but such reasons are themselves motives. Therefore it would seem that, unless we are content to accept Determinism, the will cannot be said, with any meaning, to follow always the strongest motive."—*Month*, April, 1878, p. 499.

by way of habit, or of both : and much more the thought of *missing* the visit is exquisitely repulsive. By this means a second favourable modification—and a very considerable one—takes place, of my original spontaneous impulse towards staying in bed. Very soon some moment will arrive, in which my predominant impulse is, indeed, still towards staying in bed, though very far less intensely than at first ; but in which, on the other hand, my motive for getting up is presented far more vividly to my mind than it was originally. Our opponent must say that, even at this much more favourable moment, I have still no psychical power of rising from bed. He must say that I have no power of rising, until my preponderant impulse itself comes to be in that direction. We venture strongly to maintain the opposite position. No other ultimate appeal is of course possible, except to the observed facts of human nature. But we cannot think that such appeal will favour our opponent's doctrine.

III. A Catholic friend, of much ability, who takes great interest in things philosophical, has (at our request) put on paper the following criticism, which he had at first more briefly expressed in conversation :—

The position, assumed by the Determinist is this. The same ("similar" is more correct) antecedents *in all respects* being given, the same ("similar") act of will will infallibly follow. This statement you deny, and maintain, in opposition, that all the antecedent circumstances being precisely similar, the *consequent*, viz., the act of will will at one time be in accordance with these antecedents constituting the "*preponderating attraction*," and at another time in opposition to them, viz., an act of resistance to this "*preponderating attraction*." Your proof consists in an appeal to every man's experience. Now on this I remark that if this act of will, viz., resistance to "*preponderating attraction*," were *without a motive* to serve as a fresh antecedent, then (on the supposition that consciousness testifies to this *motiveless* resistance), the Determinist is completely answered by the experience of all mankind. But neither he nor you admit that the act of resistance is motiveless. He in his own language would say that it has a fixed antecedent, which does not form one of those included in what you call the "*preponderating attraction*;" and you, if I understand you rightly, would say that we are induced to resist by "*motives*," using the term in your sense of the word. If then, it is admitted on both sides that the act of resistance has an *antecedent*, or is consequent upon a *motive*, such as a resolution always to pursue what is virtuous,—I can well conceive the Determinist replying to you in this way. You maintain, in relation to the will, he will say, that all the antecedents being the same, the *consequent* act of will will not always be the same. On the contrary, it will sometimes be just the contrary of what it was before. The man, you say, will *resist* instead of *complying* with the "*preponderating attraction*"—but then you add he will resist "*for some*

worthy motive”—“induced to do so by one or other of these two classes of motives.” Now this *motive*, for the sake of which he resists, or which induced him to resist, must necessarily have been in the man’s thoughts *before* he willed or determined to resist, and thus formed a fresh antecedent. Nor does it affect the question at issue of what kind this motive may be—it is immaterial whether it be a dictate of reason, or a previous act of will resulting in a present fixed resolution; for my present fixed resolution—to pursue, for example, what is virtuous—is quite a distinct act from that by which I determine that I will not in the present instance follow the impulse urging me to commit this particular sin. The case therefore stands thus. A man is violently tempted to *resolve* upon an act of vengeance; for the moment the antecedents are such as always have been and always will be followed by the resolve “I will take revenge”—the “preponderating attraction” is to yield to the temptation. The next moment, and before the man has time to make his resolve, the thought springs up in his mind that it is wrong to take revenge; that it is contrary to his fixed resolution always to pursue what is virtuous. And now the case is completely changed: a fresh antecedent has been added to those previously existing—and in consequence of this fresh antecedent, that which before was the “preponderating attraction” has ceased to be so. No wonder, therefore, that the *consequent* act is also different, and that the man instead of resolving that he will be revenged, resolves that he will not. In making his resolve he follows what *was* not but *is* the “preponderating attraction.” Such is the answer that I fancy a Determinist would give to your Articles, and which I meant to imply when I last saw you. I think upon that occasion that I put it briefly thus, you show that a man resists his *sensitive appetite* (“preponderating attraction”) but not that he will resist “motives” and sensitive appetite combined.

Our critic quite rightly understands us, as resting our case on observed and unmistakable mental phenomena. But he does not rightly apprehend (we should say) what those phenomena *are*, on which we rest our case. He thinks (if we rightly understand him) that we appeal to experience, as *immediately* disproving Determinism. He thinks we appeal to the experience of two different moments, as immediately evincing that two precisely similar groups of mental antecedents may exist at two different moments, and may nevertheless be followed respectively by a dissimilar mental consequent. But we never alleged anything of the kind; nor do we for a moment think that any such *immediate* experience of Indeterminism is possible. Certainly we appeal with great confidence to, and found our whole argument on, what we consider to be an unmistakable fact of immediate experience. That fact is, that very frequently my will’s spontaneous impulse is in one direction, at the very moment when my conduct is in a different—often the very contrary—direction. If this statement of ours were disproved, no doubt our

whole argument would be overthrown; but we think that the period of such disproof will not be earlier than the Greek Kalends. On the other hand, our present critic seems to understand us as resting on *inference* or *conjecture* our response to the inquiry, what is at this moment my will's spontaneous impulse? But, on the contrary, *this* is the very fact which we base on *immediate* experience. We say, not that in all cases, but that in very many cases, experience pronounces on this matter immediately and unmistakably. I know immediately and most unmistakably, by the self-inspection of this moment, that my *conduct* of the moment is proceeding in a direction different from my *spontaneous impulse* of the moment. We are not comparing one moment and its thoughts with another moment and *its* thoughts. We are dwelling on one compound phenomenon (as we have called it), which exists at one and the same moment. This is our fundamental premiss, our phenomenal fulcrum. From this premiss we *infer* (1) the doctrine of Indeterminism, and (2) the full doctrine of Free Will. In the preceding pages (see pp. 314-316) we have duly set forth—accordantly with our earlier Articles—what is the process of reasoning, by which we purport to establish those two doctrines. We cannot see that our able friend has written anything which invalidates our position. Firstly, we cannot see that he has said anything to throw doubt on the correctness of that report (given by self-inspection) to which we have referred. Nor, secondly, can we see that he has said anything, to throw doubt on the validity of that argumentative process, which we have *based* on the report given by self-inspection. But if that report be correct, and if that argumentation be also valid, Determinism is disproved and Free Will established.

It will be seen, then, that the criticisms which have reached us have not led us to change our opinion in any particular; though we feel how such a confession may leave us open to the charge of obstinacy and undue self-confidence. But, at all events, we feel deeply that our critics have conferred on us service of great moment, by making us aware of several particulars on which our language had been obscure, and by thus enabling us to amend and strengthen our exposition.

We will conclude (for the present) our treatment of Free Will, with a remark which has already been made by Dr. Mivart in one of his admirable Papers. We have more than once asked Determinists to explain, on what argumentative ground they base their Determinism. They do not venture to allege that direct self-inspection furnishes them with phenomena which, taken by themselves, even invest their case with strong *probability*. The answer they commonly give to the

inquiry is the same with that which we quoted from Dr. Bain last April (p. 292). They consider the fact sufficiently established, that the general *rule* of Nature is phenomenal uniformity; and they argue that this rule is to be accepted as holding in all doubtful cases, until an exception is made good. We maintained, in reply (pp. 290, 294, 295), that such an argument "does not carry with it so much as the slightest appearance of probability," unless Dr. Bain begins by *assuming*, on his own side, what is the one vital and fundamental point of difference between him and his opponents. But, even were there far more force than we can possibly admit in Dr. Bain's analogies and conjectures, they would avail him nothing against our direct appeal to experience. We have argued, that our own Libertarian conclusions do not rest in any way on any kind of analogy or conjecture; but that they are inferred demonstratively, from what is the unmistakable and immediate report of direct self-inspection. We retort, therefore, Dr. Bain's premiss directly against his own position. We accept his premiss, that Free Will is a complete anomaly and eccentricity in Nature. To this we subjoin our own premiss, that Free Will indubitably exists. The inference, which may legitimately be drawn by combination of these two premisses, is (we think) of much importance and significance.

We entirely concur, then, with Dr. Bain in holding that, among all other phenomena whatever,—among all phenomena, except those of the human will,—the law of uniformity ordinarily prevails.* This particular class of phenomena stands out in isolated and startling opposition, to the otherwise universal law of phenomenal existence. Surely the most ordinarily inquiring philosopher, to whom such a circumstance shall be made clear, cannot do otherwise than muse on the *meaning* of this (as it were) miraculous and bewildering fact. There is no tenet held by *Antitheists*, which throws on it any light or significance whatever. On the other hand, what is well known to be among the most characteristic and fundamental doctrines of *Theism*, is precisely and emphatically correlative to that abnormal and prodigious anomaly, which is called Free Will. According to the Theist's doctrine, the one reason for which men are placed in this world is their moral probation. Even their physical well-being is (in the Theist's eye) a matter of indefinitely minor moment, except so far as it is connected with their moral advancement. And as to the rise and fall of Empires, the intellectual triumphs of philosophies,

* We say "ordinarily," because, of course, we hold that *miraculous* intervention is a sufficiently frequent fact.

the marvels of mechanical invention, the one primary importance of these things—predominating indefinitely over all others put together—is their ministration to the moral interests of mankind. We hope, in our future course, to establish this doctrine firmly on the foundations of reason. What we are now pointing out is its deep harmony with those experienced facts, on which we have dwelt in this and earlier articles. There can be no such thing as morality in the Theistic sense, without Free Will. *Admit* Theistic morality, Free Will becomes (one may say) a matter of course. *Deny* Theistic morality, Free Will is an uncouth, unmeaning, portentous exception to the whole course of Nature.

After we had written the immediately preceding paragraphs, we called to mind a passage of Mr. Hutton's, so singularly bearing on their purport, that we are sure our readers will be pleased by our inserting extracts from it. We italicise a word or two here and there.

The consciousness of moral obligation, and that of moral freedom which accompanies it, are due to no abstracting process. . . . They are the essential characteristics of a very positive experience, which . . . forces on us the sense of a power which besets our moral life, while absolutely penetrating all the physical conditions of our existence. . . . Accustomed as man is to feel his personal feebleness, his entire subordination to the physical forces of the universe—unable as he is to affect in the smallest degree either the laws of his body or the fundamental constitution of his mind—it is not without a necessary sense of supernatural awe that, *in the case of moral duty*, he finds this almost constant pressure *remarkably withdrawn* at the very crisis in which the import of his action is brought home to him with the most vivid conviction. . . . The absolute control that sways so much of our life is *waived* just where we are impressed with the most profound conviction that there is *but one path* in which we can walk with a free heart. . . . The sense that a supernatural eye is upon us in duty is so strong, because the *relaxation of restraint* comes simultaneously with a *deep sense of obligation*—just as the child is instinctively aware, when the sustaining hand is taken away, that *the parent's eye is all the more intent on his unassisted movement*.—"Essays" (Second Edition), vol. i. pp. 33, 34.

W. G. WARD.



ART. IV.—THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

PART II.

1. *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century.* By LESLIE STEPHEN. In Two Volumes. London, 1876.
2. *History of England in the Eighteenth Century.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LEECHY. Vols. I. and II. London, 1878.
3. *Geschichte des 18en u. 19en Jahrhunderts.* Von F. C. SCHLOSSER. Seven Vols. Heidelberg, 1836-49.
4. *La Femme au Dix-huitième Siècle.* Par EDMOND et JULES DE GONCOURT. Paris, 1862.

THE century preceding the outbreak of the French Revolution, which, as I have observed in a former Article, is what I must be understood to mean when I speak of the eighteenth century, has been aptly designated *le siècle Français*. Its predominant political idea was that which has found its most perfect expression in the monarchy of Louis XIV. In the intellectual order it was most potently affected by the doctrine derived by the French *philosophes* from Locke, but cast into their own mould, and carried to a conclusion, logical indeed, but which the English thinker undoubtedly had never contemplated. In the preceding Paper* I have endeavoured to show that both the State of Louis XIV. and the philosophy of Locke were the development in their respective spheres of the principle of materialism, which was the essence of the Renaissance. The year 1688 I have taken to mark the end of the second and the beginning of the third or ultimate era in the history of that principle, and I have traced in outline its progress up to that date. I now proceed to my proper subject, which is to sketch its working in the world, under both its forms, from the year 1688 to the great catastrophe in which it had its consummation. I shall have to consider, first, the progress of the Renaissance political idea, next of the philosophical, in Continental Europe during the last century, and then I shall glance at our own country and try to indicate the position it occupied with respect to those ideas, and the influence which it exercised upon their career. Whatever the other difficulties of my task—and they are numerous and grave—it is simplified by the fact that

* DUBLIN REVIEW for April, 1879.

society is everywhere marching in the same direction. In England, indeed, politics had been diverted into a course opposed to that of the Continental monarchies by the Revolution of 1688, which, also, as I shall point out, had the effect of withdrawing, to a great extent, this country from the influence of the general current of European thought. But, putting England aside, almost the whole of Europe presents, notwithstanding superficial peculiarities and partial divergences, a unity of movement which is very striking. The progress of other Continental countries was, for the most part, in lines parallel to that of France. Paris was, as it were, the heart of Europe, where the attentive ear might catch the pulsations of its political and spiritual life.

Such is the manner in which I propose to deal with my subject. In the present Article I must confine myself to one portion of it, namely, the consideration of the political idea of this *siècle Français*, the idea ruling through the eighteenth century in the public order of Continental Europe, and of which the external phenomena of its history are the outcome and visible expression.

Let us first, then, turn to France. Over the last quarter of a century of Louis XIV.'s reign I shall not linger. I have already dwelt at sufficient length upon the character of his system. In that character the reverses of his later years wrought no change. His last important public act, indeed, was the supreme manifestation of the egotism which dominated his whole career, and which had eaten out in him, in the event, all sense of public or private duty, of the fundamental obligations of morality, nay, of the ordinary decencies of life. The Edict of 1714, placing in the order of succession to the throne his illegitimate children—already raised to the rank and privileges of princes of the blood—was a public consecration of adultery from which even the Cæsarism of the old world would have recoiled, while it shook the very foundations of the monarchy by the dishonour which it cast upon the throne. The annulling of the royal testament immediately after the king's decease, by the Parliament of Paris, was hailed throughout France as a rejection of despotism arrived at an intolerable excess. The earliest measures of the Duc d'Orléans upon obtaining as regent the plenitude of the sovereign power, free from the trammels which his uncle had sought to impose from the tomb, appeared to indicate a change in the polity so long established. The right of remonstrance, of which the Parliaments had been deprived in 1672, was restored. Scope for the employment of the magnates of the kingdom in

public affairs was sought to be afforded by the organization of six administrative councils.* Twenty-five thousand men were restored to agriculture by the reduction of the army, and some amelioration was attempted in the method of collecting and administering the finances. But these measures were infructuous. The great judicial corporations, powerful instruments of opposition, were powerless to reform, and the protracted strife with the executive authority into which they soon plunged, was absolutely sterile. The nobles were unversed in the conduct of business: the six council proved wholly inefficient, and recourse was had to the old means of administration. The economical condition of the country underwent no improvement. The fifty-nine years during which the grandson of Louis XIV. sat upon the French throne, witnessed, not merely the continuation of his predecessor's system, but its further development—for there is no standing still in politics—under conditions which necessarily conducted it to its fall. No doubt the imbecility of Louis XV. conduced greatly to the final catastrophe; but probably the doom of the ancient order was irrevocably sealed before his time. The internal decay of France as Louis XIV.'s life drew to a close, is contemporaneous with the decline of its external splendour. Nor were an empty treasury and a starving people, that monarch's worst legacies to his successor. The exhaustion of France, when his reign of well nigh three quarters of a century ended, was felt in other and far more important quarters than the material. All the elements of healthy national life had gradually died out from society. The nobility sunk into the titled lacqueys of the monarch, crowded the anti-chambers of Versailles, strangers to all political ambition beyond that involved in the greed for place or pension, consuming their energies in barren quarrels among themselves; fawning upon the king and the king's favourites, insolent to the rest of the world. The clergy had still the semblance of an independent order. But it was only the semblance. Bound hand and foot by the fetters of the Gallican liberties, they had become merely a department of the royal service, and their assemblies were regulated by the Court through courtier bishops. The Parliaments alone prevented the power of the monarch from attaining the proportions of

* Schlosser quotes the following sentence from an autograph letter of the Regent's to Cardinal de Tremoville:—"La situation présente de ce royaume, la disposition des esprits lassés de voir chaque partie du gouvernement entre les mains d'un seul homme pendant tout le règne précédent, la nécessité de rétablir la confiance en donnant une nouvelle forme à l'administration des affaires, firent recevoir cette proposition avec un applaudissement universel."—Vol. iii. c. iii. § 1, Note.

Turkish or Muscovite despotism ; but the check which they imposed upon it was of fitful and ineffectual operation. It was indeed the legists themselves who had sustained the doctrine that the monarch was "the sole and perpetual representative of the nation," while the prevailing theology averred that he was the immediate and special delegate of God Himself. In truth all power and all public functions were assumed by the king. France was his private domain with which it was lawful for him to do what he would. The revenues of the State were his own personal income, to be expended on wars or women, public works or private whims, as he might determine. The service of the State was a vast and ill-organized administration, barely within the grasp of Louis XIV. in his most vigorous hour, and which slipped from his enfeebled hand when old age overtook him. He was the soul of it, and his death was the signal for its dissolution. It is easy now, after the event, to see how during Louis XV.'s long reign of official anarchy that dissolution was being surely accomplished ; how the monarchy was ever growing more and more impotent in its action ; how a whole order of things was becoming bankrupt. It required extraordinary gifts to see it then : for never was the external splendour of the throne greater than during that half century ; never were the pretensions of Renaissance Cæsarism more fully maintained ; never was the prerogative of the crown pushed further.* In 1770, a few years before his death, Louis XV. when bringing, as he fondly hoped, his protracted dispute with the Parliament of Paris to a close by an act so high-handed that his grandfather at the summit of his power would have shrunk from it, could assert : "*Nous ne tenons notre couronne que de Dieu. Le droit de faire les lois par lesquelles nos sujets doivent être conduits et gouvernés nous appartient, à nous seuls, sans dépendance et sans partage.*" It is curious to reflect that but a century ago, we find a French sovereign employing such language unchallenged : language almost identical with that which in the fourteenth century cost our Richard II. so dear.†

As I have said the political progress of most Continental countries during the eighteenth century, was in lines parallel to that of France. The same theories were in possession, were officially recognized, and were practically carried out. Shorn as the French monarchy was of much of the prestige which had attached to it in the palmy days of Louis XIV., it's

* Lord Chesterfield writes to his son, "*Le gouvernement de la France est une monarchie absolue ou despotique; c'est-à-dire que le roi y fait tout ce qu'il veut, de sorte que le peuple est esclave.*"

† See Stubb's "*Constitutional History*," vol. ii. p. 505.

external splendours were still very dazzling and attractive to the other monarchs of Europe ; it was the type to what they sought to approximate. During the whole of the reign of Louis XV. the advance of absolutism in Europe, in the machinery and outward expression of government was unchecked. In the two great Catholic States especially, Austria and Spain, the notion of immediate Divine right which had become the main idea of the French polity, was asserted with a baldness and intolerance, which it is difficult in these days, properly to realize. The monarchs were as demigods ; and the bare mention of the liberty of the subject was shuddered at, as a kind of sacrilege. But as Schlosser truly observes, "the French system was received and imitated by the European Governments, even in those countries where the form of the State was not military and monarchical, as was the case in most."* The tendency everywhere was to concentrate all authority in the hands of the Prince, and so—inherent vice of despotism !—to leave the throne without any sort of equipoise. Thus, in the Republic of Holland, a few years before the middle of the century, the Stadholder had obtained an accession of power and dignity which rendered him barely distinguishable from an absolute sovereign. Sweden, which in 1720 had recovered its ancient Constitution, set aside in the previous century for unlimited monarchy, fell in 1772 under the despotism of Gustavus, to whom France had supplied money wherewith to effect this revolution. Three years before Struensee had introduced into Denmark a similar change, which was destined to survive the brief authority of its author. Some remarkable words were addressed by the Doge Renier, in 1762, to the Venetian Senate, warning them of the danger which threatened them, through the hatred of monarchs for institutions which to any extent savoured of freedom. All the sovereigns of Europe, he urged, were watching the Republics, ready for aggression. One of the most curious and important phenomena of the age—which I can only barely mention here—is the rise of the new Hohenzollern monarchy, an aristocratic military system, dealing with a nation as with a regiment ; differing in very essential particulars from the old sovereignties, but like them recognizing material force as the foundation of power, and avowedly disregarding in politics the obligation of morality and justice. This is, indeed, a special note of the eighteenth century. Alike in Catholic States and in Protestant, we find the same cynical indifference to law, the same open recognition of might as synonymous with right ; the same loss of all conception of a

* Schlosser, vol. iii. Int. § 1.

public conscience. It was natural, therefore, that the one Power in the world, whose very *raison d'être* it is to bear witness to the reign of law and the supremacy of conscience, should be almost effaced from the political order. It is remarked by Cardinal Hergenröther, "the eighteenth century was a period of the deepest servitude and ignominy for the Catholic Church ;"* and if it were necessary a vast mass of evidence might be adduced in support of the assertion. But it is unnecessary, for the fact is patent. Never had the influence of the Holy See fallen so low in the European system since that system had been called into existence. France had set the example to the Catholic world of withdrawing the spiritual order from the control of its head, and of turning the clergy into a department of the administration, ready to do the bidding and to receive the rewards of despotism. The other Powers of Europe, here as elsewhere, were ready to follow the example set by France, nay, to better the instruction. So low had the Vicar of Christ fallen in the eyes of the world that the smallest, the most insignificant of the Italian States thought it an honourable distinction to be embroiled with the Pontifical Government. Among the pettiest potentates there was "none so poor to do him reverence," while the great monarchies were able by threats and entreaties to make him appear to the world as their accomplice in an act which gave a deadly wound to his Divinely-constituted power, and which in its utter lawlessness and wickedness may be paralleled with the worst deeds of the worst of the pagan Cæsars. The Society of Jesus was the last remaining bulwark of the authority of the Holy See. No better illustration of the political condition of Europe as the eighteenth century wore on can be found than that which is supplied by the story of its suppression. Often, therefore, as the tale has been told, it is worth while to pause here to recall it and to regard it from this point of view.

More than two centuries had passed away since Ignatius Loyola and his five companions had founded *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*, the society which, according to the Evangelical word, was to be hated of all men for the name it bears. In the impulse by which they were inspired the Catholic recognises a Divine suggestion. The Protestant will not, at all events, refer it to the stirrings of any low or selfish ambition. It is not possible, or indeed necessary, for me to trace, even in outline, the career of the mighty order which had its beginnings in the little church of Montmartre, to relate how the burning zeal and indomitable patience, and winning sanctity of its Fathers,

* "Catholic Church and Christian States," vol. ii. p. 415, Eng. Tr.

brought whole nations to Christ in the dim mysterious East and in the new-found Western world, while reviving the honour of His name among European populations who unworthily bore it. Nor need I inquire into the offences which came as time went on and the fame of the new apostles went abroad and they were compelled to dwell in king's houses—lodging ever perilous to the prophets of God—the great ones of the earth turning to them, not only for spiritual counsels, but sometimes also for secular guidance. I am by no means concerned to reduce to true proportions the accusations made against the Society, far less to justify the policy, upon all occasions, of those who from time to time governed it, or to vindicate the teaching of every moral theologian who has worn its robe. It is enough to state, what is indisputable, that the sons of St. Ignatius did a work for a parallel to which in the history of the Church we must go back to the earliest ages of Christianity. No obstacles wearied their gentle patience, no dangers shook their calm courage. Enduring, as seeing Him who is invisible, persecution seemed to be the proper element of their lives, and they appeared to be in love with death. Their end, indeed, was wholly supernatural; but in pursuing it they were eminent benefactors to the world in the natural order also. Devoting themselves to the training of youth in sound learning and religious education, they numbered in their community the most distinguished representatives not only of theological but of secular science. In their missionary labours they were the pioneers of geographical discovery and material civilization, while founding the only political communities the world has seen in these latter days in which the Gospel of Jesus Christ was simply adopted as the rule of life. Even their bitterest enemies, the *philosophes* of the last century, praised their Paraguayan settlements as a model for the world,* which an historian of our own age—hardly less hostile to them and to the religion they diffused—confesses that life there was “like a calm and tranquil sea which reflected the image of the Creator.”† Pouring their peaceful hosts from their centre at Rome throughout the whole world, they subdued it more effectually than the ancient legions, for the weapons of their

* Montesquieu, Condamine, and Raynal were of this opinion.

† Schlosser, vol. iv. p. 222. Schlosser, however, considers that this celebrated Government was “unsuitable to the destination of man upon earth, although it might have been very good for angels.” In the next page, indeed, he acknowledges that the Indians were peaceful and contented under the administration of the Jesuits, finding their happiness in what he calls “a state of non-progression.” His utterances remind one irresistibly of those of Balaam the son of Beor.

warfare were not carnal, but spiritual; their aim not to rule over the bodies of men, but to free their souls.

Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?

they might well have asked, had it not been incompatible with the spirit of humility which dominated them, that they should think anything of themselves as of themselves. And the verse would have borne a wider as well as a profounder sense upon their lips than it bore upon the lips of Virgil. Their sound went out into all lands—the sound which had greeted the birth of Him by whose Name they were called “*Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra Pax,*” and in every land they triumphed in the might of that Name. Churches and shrines were the trophies of their bloodless victories; or if not bloodless, purchased by the blood of their own martyrs; not the din of battle, but the music of holy bells, marked their progress; not broken hearts, but healed consciences; not cities plundered, and women ravished and infants wantonly slain, but well-ordered towns, and virgins dedicated to God, and little children delivered from oblation to devils and brought into the family of Jesus and Mary. Such were their labours of which every region of the earth was full. When the eighteenth century had but half completed its course, we are told, the Society numbered twenty-two thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven men, divided into thirty-nine provinces, occupying twenty-four professed houses, six hundred and sixty-nine colleges, sixty-one novitiates, one hundred and ninety-six seminaries, three hundred and thirty-eight presidencies, and two hundred and twenty-three missions. Into such a mighty tree had the grain of mustard-seed planted by St. Ignatius grown, a tree overshadowing the whole earth, and whose leaves were for the healing of the nations.

The suppression of the Society of Jesus is an event the true significance of which has been very imperfectly understood. The first step towards a proper appreciation of it is the recognition of the fact that it was the result of a European movement. The monstrous cruelties inflicted by Pombal upon the Society have fascinated the imagination of men. Hence they have been accustomed to look to Portugal as the very source and fount of the persecution, and to see in the measures taken against the Jesuits in other countries but a consequence of the contagion of a bad example, a feeble imitation, a pale reflection of the barbarities of Carvalho. And this is natural enough. The savage cruelty of the Portuguese Minister was well fitted to arrest the attention of Europe and to excite the ferocity ever latent in human nature. Even Schlosser confesses that it “can only find its parallel in the kingdoms of the East or in

Russia.”* For myself I do not hesitate to avow my conviction that the worst horrors of the French Revolution pale beside the barbarities of the Inconfidenza, and that the judicial murder of the saintly Malgrida was a worse atrocity—because more destitute of any shadow of justification—than the worst deeds of the Committee of Public Safety. But in truth the action of some of the other European Powers was hardly less inhuman than that of the Portuguese. “On the night of the 31st of March, 1767 (I am quoting the narrative of Schlosser), all the Jesuits in every part of Spain were arrested as if by magic, and their estates seized upon. It is supposed that more than five thousand ecclesiastics, who were for the most part very learned, meritorious, and highly-esteemed men, were taken prisoners in this single night. . . . Ships were long ago prepared and were lying ready on different parts of the coast in order that they might be conveyed to Civita Vecchia.” “The fate of these unfortunate men,” Schlosser continues, “was sufficient to melt a heart of stone. Many of them were old, weak, or ill. Some of them were persons of the highest worth and distinction, but all were crowded together in the ships like African slaves, and compelled to undergo unspeakable sufferings.” Similar measures of violence were adopted against the Jesuits of Naples and Parma; and if the conduct of the French and Austrian Governments was less merciless, it was equally effective. The crowning blow was dealt through the Apostolic See itself. On the 2nd of July, 1773, yielding to overwhelming pressure brought to bear upon him by the Ambassadors of France, Spain, and Naples, and seeing no other way of preventing a widespread schism, Clement XIV. issued the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*, and the Society of Jesus, after a career of two hundred and thirty-three years, ceased to exist.

It is of the highest importance towards a correct appreciation of the history of the eighteenth century to understand the true causes which led to this catastrophe. Many explanations of it have been tendered, some of them of surprising ineptitude. Such are those which account for it by the anger of a courtesan or the hatred of a politician;† while the reasons alleged by the

* Vol. iv., Third Period, c. l. § ii.

† Ranke remarks—“In the Appendix to the Memoirs of Mme. de Hausset there is an Essay ‘De la Destruction des Jésuites en France,’ in which Choiseul’s hatred to the Jesuits is ascribed to the circumstance of the General of the Order having given him to understand at Rome that he knew what had been said at a supper at Paris. This is a story which has been repeated in many different ways; but which has very little probability. The causes, no doubt, lay much deeper.”—“Hist. of the Popes,” vol. iii. p. 139, Note.

persecutors of the Society, whether in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, or Germany, may at once be put aside, as, by the confession even of historians most strongly prejudiced against it, they are manifest fables. That the Jesuits were the instigators of the attempt of Damiens upon the life of Louis XV., or of the conspiracy attributed to the Duke of Aveira against Joseph I. of Portugal, are palpable lies which no sober man believes now. Probably no sober man ever believed them when they were first invented and instilled into the popular ear. Of equal value is Pombal's assertion as "a certain and notorious fact," that they had arrived at a perfect understanding with the English, whom they had promised to introduce into all the territories which Spain and Portugal possessed south of the Line—an invention of a grandiose audacity which entitles its author to rank with Barrère. Even the charge so perseveringly urged, not without a certain show of evidence, of trading contrary to the canons, melts away under close examination. To account for the overthrow of the Society by such reasons, is, as Mr. Buckle has well expressed it, "to confuse the cause of an act with the pretext under which the act is committed."*

Mr. Buckle further observes that the real cause of the abolition of the Jesuits was that "they obstructed the progress of mankind; they stood in the way of the age, and the age swept them from its path." Here, too, I agree with him, although I should employ quite other terms than his to describe "the way of the age," and should differ most widely from him as to the true character and ultimate goal of its progress. The real cause of the abolition of the Jesuits must be sought in the spirit of their institution. St. Ignatius arose in an age of the world when the principle of the Renaissance was sapping the authority of the Church in her rule and in her doctrine, and attacking her in the very centre of her unity, when, as Ranke observes,† "the Pope experienced opposition on every side," when, apparently, "he had nothing to expect but a lingering and progressive decline." It was then that the Society of Jesus was formed—"a Society of volunteers full of zeal and enthusiasm, with the express purpose of devoting themselves exclusively to the service of the Sovereign Pontiff," of retaining the Catholic world in his obedience, and reducing to it the non-Catholic world, of upholding his supreme authority and indefeasible rights. The Society was thus brought into immediate conflict not only with the development of the Renaissance principle in the spiritual order, which may be termed Protestantism or Scepticism,

* "Hist. of Civilization," vol. ii. c. vii.

† Vol. i. p. 132.

but also with the Cæsarism which it introduced into the public order; that pagan idea of absolute monarchy, striving, as I have shown, from the first, to assert its independence of the public law of Christendom, of which the Vicar of Christ had been the judge, to stifle the voice of that public conscience of which he had been the keeper and witness. Hence it was that to Jesuit theologians were due those great vindications of the polity of Christendom, against the novel theories which the advocates of the immediate Divine right of kings and unlimited passive obedience had devised to support the new monarchy. It was the especial glory of Suarez that he recalled to an age which was fast forgetting it the true doctrine of St. Thomas, and his teaching was in the main that of the Society generally, some of whose writers, indeed, in their zeal against the prevailing errors, carried it to undue lengths. It is manifest that the Jesuit theologians insisting, on the one hand, upon the supreme authority, the high prerogatives of the Pope, the accountability to him of Christian princes, and his power of deposition, while, on the other, they laid down the limited and fiduciary character of regal power, and its derivation through the people, must have been in the highest degree distasteful to absolutist monarchs. And so in effect it was. Philip II. of Spain regarded Suarez as a Republican; the Parliament of Paris burnt his writings; the hostility of the Society to kings was a favourite commonplace of Protestants, Jansenists and Gallicans. Of course I am aware that particular Jesuit Fathers were the chosen spiritual advisers of monarchs who were the very type of the new Cæsarism; and that the Society itself was at times protected and favoured in the dominions of such monarchs. But that does not in the least affect my argument. The concern of the Jesuits, with secular politics, was only, if I may so speak, accidental and by the way. Their primary object, their sole object was religion. Except so far as religion was involved, the external order of society, the civil polity of States, concerned them not. The absolute sovereign was as proper an object of their ministry as the beggar or the leper; nor would they hesitate to employ their influence with the royal and the noble among the penitents for the advancement of the sacred cause to which they were devoted. Here, as elsewhere, *Ad Dei Majorem Gloriam* was their great rule. But principles are stronger than men. And as time went on, and limitation after limitation disappeared from the royal authority, it was natural that kings should at last attack the Society which was the standing witness of the claims of an allegiance higher than any due to the national ruler, and a perpetual testimony of the restricted character of his power.

It is somewhere remarked by M. Guizot, that if the Christian Church had not existed, the world would have been abandoned to material force. Not one of the least of the claims of the Society of Jesus upon the gratitude of mankind is that in the Renaissance epoch, when monarchs throughout Europe were labouring with ever-increasing success to assert the unbridled power of material force, it stood forth by its very constitution and rule as an obstacle and a protest. It is simple matter of fact that in the eighteenth century the Jesuits were the chief champions of the spiritual order, ever bearing witness to its claims and asserting its supremacy, and, at the last, when the battle was lost, perishing in the sacred cause to which they were faithful, even unto death.

That this is the true account for the reasons which led the Bourbon Courts to resolve upon the destruction of the society, I am satisfied. What I am advancing is no mere nude theory, but to draw out with any fulness the proof of it would be a long undertaking. All I can do here is to turn to one of the volumes before me, and to cite some of the evidence which is presented by Schlosser, a hostile witness, whose testimony is of the more value, because it is given, as if in spite of himself, and with a very dim apprehension of its real value and significance. Pombal, then, he considers "to have been raised up to organize a monarchical reign of terror" and to have been led into the "contest" with the Jesuits (the word "contest" reminds one of the comic poet's *si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas ego vapulo tantum*) by his dread of them "as a dangerous independent order, with a chief dwelling at Rome, a monarchical power beyond the reach of any secular arm."* He points out that the grounds avowedly put forward for the abolition of the Society by the Parliament of Paris, and urged upon Louis XV. by the Duc de Choiseul and Madame de Pompadour, were that it was inimical to the king's sovereign rule.† We read that the pedant in whose hands was the Government of Naples, and whose main object was to obtain in that kingdom for the monarch, "the same rights and privileges which the Bourbons enjoyed in France,"‡ avowedly rested the justification and defence of his atrocious cruelties upon the doctrine of this immediate Divine right of kings.§ Charles III. of Spain, we are told, was induced to—

* Vol. iv. pp. 218, 219.

† Ibid., p. 275.

‡ Ibid., p. 279.

§ Ibid., p. 286. The following is the language Tanucci puts into the mouth of his Sovereign:—"Noi, il re, facendo uso della suprema indipendente potestà che riconosciamo immediatamente da Dio, unita della sua onnipotenza inseparabilmente alla nostra sovranità per il

coincide with the French and those who supported them against the Jesuits, as the whole system of this spiritual order appeared to be completely inconsistent with the monarchical government of the eighteenth century.* Thus this king, who attached as much value to autocracy as all those do who are accustomed to rule, was led to regard this religious order as rivals whose power and authority he must destroy in order to maintain his own.†

And in another place‡ Schlosser observes truly enough that in the short letter sent by the Spanish monarch to the Pope, to acquaint him with the deportation of the Jesuits, "he was formally treated with scoffing and contempt."§ It seems to me that it must be as clear as day to the merest tyro in the history of the last century, that the persecution of the Jesuits was expressly directed against the Holy See. It was but one—the greatest indeed—of many attacks perseveringly and systematically made upon the Sovereign Pontiff by the Bourbon Courts. Two years after the accession of Clement XIII. the famous "family compact" had bound those Courts in strict alliance, and the ten years during which that lofty-minded and heroic pontiff occupied, not unworthily, the Chair of Gregory VII., are filled with a succession of struggles against the lawless violence and cynical impiety of the monarchs called Most Christian and Most Catholic, and the petty tyrants of their blood who were confederate with them against the Vicar of Christ. The affair of the Duke of Parma in 1768, at the close of Clement XIII.'s reign, affords so striking and significant an instance of the determination of the House of Bourbon to reduce to utter insignificance the spiritual order, that it is worth while to recall it. The Duke, a vassal of the Holy See, had issued a Pragmatic Sanction in which, among other restrictions upon the liberties of the Church, appeals to Rome were forbidden, and all Bulls, Briefs, and other Pontifical documents brought into the duchy were declared null and void. Clement betook himself to his spiritual weapons, and issued a Brief vindicating the rights of the Apostolic See and threatening the duchy with an interdict. The Duke replied with a very insulting proclamation, assuming, as Ranke expresses it, "a tone which in the former ages the mightiest monarch would not have dared to

governo e regolamento de nostri sudditi, vogliamo e comandiamo che la compagnia di Gesù sia per sempre abolita e esclusa perpetuamente da nostri regni delle Sicilie."

* Vol. iv. p. 282.

† Ibid., p. 270.

‡ Ibid., p. 285.

§ It contains such language as the following:—"That it was deemed most suitable to send these shiploads of Jesuits to Rome, because the Pope would then have them most conveniently under his spiritual superintendence."

assume;”* and the Ambassadors of France, Spain, Naples, and Portugal immediately demanded the recall of the Brief. Clement refused, and the four Powers at once proceeded to seize the possessions of the Church within their respective territories. Venice, Modena, and Genoa ostentatiously took part against the Pope. Tanucci publicly paraded an opinion that the Bishop of Rome was but as other Bishops. The Parliament of Paris resolved in full Session that the Brief against Parma was injurious to the honour and laws of all secular sovereignties and unjust. The heart of the aged Pontiff was broken. On the night of the 3rd of February he died, taken away from the evil to come. A congregation of cardinals had been summoned for the morrow to consider instant and threatening demands presented by the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Neapolitan Ambassadors for the formal dissolution of the Society of Jesus. The Pope knew well the significance of those demands. His complete vindication† of the Society remains to us: his testimony that “the body was sound, that the spirit which animated it was a spirit of purity, that its institute was without reproach, and not only without reproach, but pious, salutary, and holy: holy in its object, holy in its maxims.” He knew well that it was all this and more, and that in striking at it the representatives of monarchical absolutism were striking at the Catholic Church and her earthly head. As Ranke has well observed, “The party who strove to uphold the prerogatives of the Universal Church was particularly represented by the Jesuits, whose order appeared the main bulwark of Ultramontane principles. Against this, therefore, the whole fury of the storm was first directed.” He justly regards it as “a most striking fact,” that the Holy See had not the power to uphold the Society, and does not fail to note that its fall produced the strongest effect in Catholic countries. “The outworks being taken,” he adds, “the victorious party proceeded with greater ardour to the attack of the fortress.”‡

The fall of the Society of Jesus was the culminating triumph of Renaissance Cæsarism over the spiritual order—the sweeping away of the last vestiges of liberty in Europe. The fifteen years which intervene between the promulgation of the Brief *Dominus et Redemptor Noster* and the outbreak of the French

* “Hist. of the Popes,” vol. iii. p. 143, Eng. Tr.

† In his well-known letter to Charles III. of Spain.

‡ Vol. iii., see pp. 138–147. D. Manuel de Rocha, Minister of Charles III., writing in 1767 to the Duc de Choiseul, to announce the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain, observes: *Nous avons tué l'enfant; il ne nous reste plus qu'en à faire autant à la mère, notre Saint Église romaine.* —Cretineau-Joly, “Clément XIV. et Les Jésuites,” p. 285.

Revolution were, if I may so speak, the carnival of monarchical absolutism. Curiously enough the very forces which were blindly working to bring about its overthrow, were then most intimately leagued with it. In the attack upon the Society of Jesus the *philosophes* had been the devoted confederates of the kings.* In the continued warfare of Governments against the Church, in the attacks upon immemorial local liberties and ancient autonomies, in the determination to carry out by brute force a complete system of monarchical centralization—and this, taking Europe as a whole, is in substance the history of those fifteen years—the most effective weapons of the autocratic Powers were forged by the men who in these days, by the strange irony of popular ignorance, are so widely honoured as the apostles of liberty. Of the social, moral, and religious action of the *philosophes* I shall have to speak hereafter. Here I merely note that their direct political action was throughout Europe in support of absolutism. Fine phrases about freedom, patriotism, justice, the rights of man, were ever upon their lips, but there was no love of man or of country, no loyalty to virtue or duty in their hearts. Their ruling motive was ever the lust of material gratification and sensual enjoyment. There was hardly one of their leaders who would not sell his pen for a Chamberlain's key, or a pension, to any tyrant, however steeped in shameless vice or stained by sanguinary ambition. In France, indeed, they posed as the enemies of royalty. Louis XV. disliked and despised them. Louis XVI. was too honest, or too stupid, to win their venal suffrages. Hence the French monarchy was the standing object of their vituperation—even when the monarch was doing his feeble best to use his autocratic power for the correction of its worst abuses. Vain effort, indeed, and predoomed to failure, for who could have been sufficient for it? Certainly insufficiency† is written upon the career of Louis XVI. from first to last. He was not the Hercules to cleanse so foul an Augean stable as France had become. The very evils which his benevolence would have remedied were inherent parts of the system. The structure of regal absolutism was all of a piece. To attempt to reform it was but to accelerate the downfall of the edifice. Still, if any monarch ever deserved the help of all good men in his endeavours, and

* D'Alembert expressed the general sentiment of the sect when he wrote—"Le plus difficile sera fait quand la philosophie sera délivrée des grands grenadiers du fanatisme et de l'intolérance (viz., the Jesuits). Les autres ne sont que des Cosaques et des Pandours qui ne tiendront pas contre nos troupes réglées."

† It is hardly necessary to recall the "Mon Dieu, aidez mon insuffisance" with which his reign opened on the 10th of May, 1774.

the pity of all generous hearts in his failures, it was Louis XVI. He received neither help nor pity from the *philosophes*.*

In truth the sympathies of the *philosophes* were engrossed by other European countries where the rulers were their own pupils, and where their political theories had free course and were glorified.

C'est du Nord aujourd'hui que nous vient la lumière

wrote Voltaire; the North with its Gustavus III. of Sweden and Christian VII. of Denmark, under whose usurpations every vestige of liberty disappeared from the Scandinavian peninsula; its Catherine II. of Russia, fit nursing mother of the Church of Antichrist, who consolidated the edifice of despotism in that unhappy country. *Philosophe* principles, however, were hardly, if at all, less potential in the Governments of the south of Europe than in those of the north. D'Aranda, who continued to be the first Minister of the Spanish Crown until the death of Charles III. in 1778, was a professed disciple of Voltaire. The sanguinary Pombal caused his works to be translated into Portuguese. The aim of these two statesmen was to bring the institutions of the countries they governed into accordance with the fashionable doctrines, and they proceeded in their task with the arbitrariness of an Oriental despot, and with a cynical indifference to the sentiments, the institutions, the traditions of the people which few Oriental despots would dare to exhibit. This was especially the case in Spain. The ruling feelings of the noble Spanish people were devotion to the Catholic religion, love of their ancient customary liberties, and loyalty to their prince. Their liberties had long been under an eclipse—even in the seventeenth century the Cortes had assembled but three times, and then for mere formalities;—and the Church was humbled and degraded. The monarchy was left as the sole power of the State, and all its authority was used to carry out *philosophe* ideas. Recent writers—the late Mr. Buckle is conspicuous among them—have claimed that the despotism of Charles III. was at all events enlightened; that during the twenty-nine years of his absolute sway considerable material progress was made in Spain. I am by no means concerned to deny that this was so, although Mr. Buckle certainly overstates his case. Of Charles III.'s "reforms," some existed only upon paper; many were absolutely unsuited to the genius of the people; very few permanently took root. It is incontestable that a country may attain much prosperity and splendour under a despotic Government. But if any lesson is clear from history, it is this—that in the long run (to borrow the words of

* I am speaking generally; the "virtuous Turgot" and a few others are merely the exceptions which prove the rule.

a great English writer) "to live by one man's will is the cause of all men's misery." As Mr. Buckle justly observes, "habits of self-government, a feeling of self-reliance, are the spring and the source of all real greatness in a people." *Philosophe* legislation and administration in Spain did their best to destroy the last remains of those habits and that feeling, already trampled under by centuries of despotism, and at the death of Charles III. they were apparently eradicated, although subsequent events indeed showed that the sacred fire still smouldered in the hearts of the people, and was capable of being fanned into a flame.*

The political condition of Italy on the eve of the French Revolution did not materially differ from that of Spain. The principles of the new French philosophy were professed by well-nigh all her rulers, and a despotism called "enlightened" generally prevailed. Tuscany was regarded as her model State, and Leopold II. was celebrated throughout the world for his "reforms." But his administration was really only a copy of the *doctrinaire* absolutism of his brother Joseph, under easier conditions and with larger success. Joseph himself is perhaps the most striking manifestation of the political tendencies of his age. Succeeding in 1780 to the sole† Government of the confederation of States, united under the hereditary sway of the House of Hapsburg, his supreme ambition was to give the world example of a *philosophe* Kaiser. "The Emperor is quite ours," wrote Voltaire to d'Alembert, and Joseph certainly did his best to justify the boast. A contemporary observer describes him as "a *philosophe* in his opinions and a despot in his conduct."‡ Ranke pronounces his "ruling

* I must observe, before I part from Mr. Buckle, what a signal example of the *doctrinaire* spirit is presented in that portion of his great undertaking which he lived to accomplish. It is hard to conceive of a wider departure from the true scientific method in history than is exhibited in his chapter on Spain. If any country stands out in medieval Europe as rich in freedom, it is this. Where else were the Commons animated by so noble a spirit of liberty as that which was extinguished at Villalar? Where shall we find so large conceptions of Constitutional Government as those embodied in such formularies as the oath of allegiance of the Cortes of Arragon?—"We who are worth as much as you, make you our king and lord on condition that you preserve our privileges and liberties; but if not, no." The facts are all against Mr. Buckle's view. But facts are of small account with writers of his school. "Spain," he pronounces dogmatically, "had the form of liberty without its spirit; hence the form, promising as it was, soon died away."—Vol. ii. c. viii. Mr. Buckle's volumes, the fruit of wide reading and much industry, indeed, are but chapters in a huge unfinished political pamphlet.

† He had for some years previously been co-regent with his mother, Marie Theresa. It was in 1765 that he became Emperor.

‡ De Ségur, "Table de l'Europe de 1781 jusqu'en 1796."

idea" to have been "to unite all the powers of the monarchy without check or limitation in his own hand."* Hence, both his attack upon local liberties and his policy of *doctrinaire* centralization throughout all his States, as well as "the incessant and destructive war which he waged against all institutions calculated to uphold the external unity of the Church."† The systems of Government which excited his admiration‡ and his envy were those of his two accomplices in the spoliation of Poland—a crime which was consummated, it will be remembered, in the year preceding the formal suppression of the Society of Jesus, and which alone is sufficient to show how completely the ideas of morality and justice in States, of public law and international right, had been effaced from the European mind. Frederick of Prussia was avowedly his hero. He professed to be proud to call himself the scholar of so great a prince. The new Hohenzollern monarchy furnished the type according to which he sought to remodel, not only his own hereditary dominions, but also the Holy Roman Empire, of which he was the head. Happily for the future of the world the task was beyond the powers of his very mediocre capacity. The Empire, with its three hundred independent States, fifty-two of them Republics, was a cumbrous organization enough, it is true. Still it preserved within it the germ of much that was precious to liberty and individuality. Nor was it doomed to be revived after the Josephine ideal.§ Not even within his own hereditary States were Joseph's "reforms" destined to any great measure of success. Mr. Carlyle not unjustly achieve reckons the net result of them to have been "to dislocate the Austrian edifice and have it ready for the Napoleonic earthquake which ensued.|| "My brother the sacristan," Frederick used scoffingly to call him, for it was in ecclesiastical affairs that his energies found their fullest scope. In the Low Countries,

* Vol. iii. p. 147.

† Ibid.

‡ It is upon Joseph and Kaunitz that the responsibility for the complicity of Austria in this iniquity must fall: not upon the noble and pious Marie Theresa, who as she expressed it "alone and no longer in vigour" (*Ich merkh wohl dass ich allein bin und nit mehr en vigeur*) could only record her unavailing sorrow and indignation to see "the honour and reputation of her house thus thrown to the winds." "In this thing," she writes to Kaunitz, "where not only public law cries to heaven against us, but also all natural justice and sound reason, I must confess never in my life to have been in such trouble, and am ashamed to show my face." See Mr. Carlyle's *Frederick the Great*, Book xxi. c. iv., where the original text of the letter is given from *Preuss.* iv. 38.

§ Joseph's schemes were effectually checked by the *Fursterbund*, devised by Frederick the Great; as to which, Book xxi. of Mr. Carlyle's *Life of that Prince* may be consulted.

|| Ibid., chap. viii.

indeed, he received a decisive check. The Netherlanders appealed against him, as their forefathers had appealed against Philip II. to their handvests. The *Joyeuse Entrée* was no dead letter. The estates of Flanders, Brabant, Hainault, Namur, and Limbourg formally determined that by his violation of the pact which he had sworn to observe, he had, according to their ancient constitutional doctrines, lost his claim upon their allegiance. In 1789 they united, and solemnly separated themselves from his obedience. But baffled as he was here, he did much in the rest of his dominions. Ranke reckons* that of more than two thousand monasteries he left only seven hundred in existence. None of the Societies of Nuns, but such as could show what he called "their obvious and practical usefulness," found mercy at his hands, and even those which he spared he severed entirely from Rome; he publicly declared himself the administrator of all the secular affairs of the Church. Meanwhile the clergy were everywhere becoming ever more and more deeply imbued with the doctrines of Gallicanism and Jansenism; the authority of the Holy See was regarded with contempt, and the Church had sunk under the most severe and humiliating of tyrannies. Von Hontheim's book was "greeted throughout Europe as if it had been a new gospel:" it was as Schlosser deems the basis of the radical administrative reforms of Joseph.† In Spain and Portugal, throughout Italy, and, in spite of the official denial by the Archbishop of Paris, we may add, in France, Febronianism prevailed. In the Holy Roman Empire the four great metropolitans were leagued against the Head of the Church, and openly meditating independence of him. Switzerland, the mountain home of liberty, was almost the only country still loyal to the Holy See: still submitting to the ancient discipline without repugnance, and not humiliated by the prerogatives of the common Father. Absolutism had followed up the victory which it had obtained in the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The Pope, long reduced to insignificance in the political order of Europe, was now ostentatiously put aside, even in the most essential matters pertaining to the government of the Church. A sagacious observer, who should have judged only by appearances of the prospects of the Catholic religion, in the decade preceding the French Revolution, might well have thought it menaced by imminent destruction. If I were asked to indicate the era when the position of the Church was most abject, in the well-nigh two thousand years that have rolled away, since she was established upon that Rock against which the gates of hell shall

* Vol. iii. p. 147.

† Schlosser, vol. iv. p. 443.

not prevail, I should turn, not to the age when martyr Popes ruled the flock in the Catacombs; not to the century which the great ecclesiastical annalist has painted in such terrible colours when *homines monstruosi, vita turpissimi, moribus perditissimi usquequaque fœdissimi* occupied in dark succession the Chair of Peter; not to the period five hundred years later, when, in the judgment of a high living authority, her rulers, some in higher, some in lower degree, were nearer compromising what never can be compromised, than ever before in her history;* not to these days of rebuke and blasphemy in which our lot is cast, when the abomination of desolation stands in the holy place, and the centre of the Christian world has become a den of thieves; not to these, nor to any other of the epochs in the Church's career, marked by temporal infelicities or ecclesiastical scandals, should I turn for the lowest point in her fortunes: but to the time when the successor of the apostle—*pellegrinus apostolicus*—began those wanderings which long years after were to end so tragically, journeying humbly to the capital of the monarch whose ancestors had reckoned the title *Advocatus Ecclesiæ* among their chief glories, to sue humbly to such men as Joseph and Kaunitz against the spoliation of God's heritage, and to sue in vain.

So much must suffice as to the political phenomena of the eighteenth century in Continental Europe. Their general signification is the extinction of civil freedom, and the destruction of its best guardian and most effective guarantee, the liberties of the Church. It is the ultimate development of the Renaissance idea in the public order. And as the century advances towards its great catastrophe, dreary, indeed—notwithstanding the sounding phrases of enlightenment, progress, and reform which were in the mouths of monarchs and statesmen and sophists—dreary, indeed, is the spectacle which Europe presents. Material power, material splendour, material gratification, are the goods really recognised, the gods really worshipped, the standards of right and wrong really employed. The most elementary rights of the people are forgotten. The most sacred things of religion are prostituted to the lust of kings, their courtiers, and their mistresses. The usurpations of absolutism find their fitting climax in blasphemy and sacrilege. Thus did the last of the Chaldean monarchs, in the intoxication of his pride and the fulness of his sensuality, lift himself up against the Lord of Heaven, and then were brought unto him "the gold and silver vessels which he had brought away out of the

* "Cardinal Newman's Occasional Sermons," p. 202.

temple that was at Jerusalem, and the king and his nobles, his wives and his concubines, drank in them. They drank wine and praised their gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, and of wood and of stone." It was in the same hour that "there appeared fingers, as it were, of the hand of a man writing over against the candlestick upon the surface of the wall of the king's palace," and recording the sentence of that mighty power which had been numbered and finished; which had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The doom of the new pagan monarchism of the last century in Europe was written as emphatically in the literature of the age, as was that of the Babylonian Empire in the mystic letters. Nor were there wanting men of "a larger spirit and knowledge and understanding, and interpretation of dreams, and showing of secrets, and resolving of difficult things," "to read the writing and show the interpretation thereof." But these warnings were unheeded, as, indeed, they were too late. The hour of doom had struck. The fiery storm of Revolution was to sweep through Europe. The outworn world was to fall in ruins before its scathing blast, and the old political order to pass away for ever.

W. S. LILLY.

ART. V.—HISTORY OF THE PRUSSIAN "KULTURKAMPF."

PART I.

UP TO THE LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR 1873.

ON the 5th of February, 1875, Pope Pius IX. wrote to the Bishops of Prussia as follows:—

Quod nunquam eventurum arbitrati sumus animo reputantes ea quæ ab hac Apostolica sede communi consilio cum supremâ Borussia potestate anno hujus sæculi vicesimo primo pro rei Catholicae incolunitate et bono constituta fuerant, id infeliciter his temporibus factum esse perspeximus in istis regionibus vestris ubi tranquillitati quâ fruebatur Ecclesia Dei, sæva et inopinata surrexit tempestas.

It is a proof of the magnanimity of the great Pontiff that he makes no allusion to the many and serious acts of oppression to which the Catholics of Prussia had been subjected since the convention of 1821. He knew well that, by the traditionary policy of Prussia, Catholics were excluded from all privileges, and exposed to much unfair treatment. The interval between the years 1821 and 1875 had witnessed fresh favours shown to

the Hermesians, and, on the other hand, the imprisonment of two Bishops for defending the law of the Church regarding mixed marriages. In the early days of his Pontificate, the complaint had reached the ears of Pius IX. that the Prussian Government—in opposition, indeed, to the desires of the generous-minded King, Frederick William IV.—had not scrupled to support the utterly extravagant pretensions of so-called German Catholicism. The Pope, however, took no notice of these things, nor of the absence of proofs of similar good-will to Catholics. He might justly have called attention to the fact that the highest offices of State in Prussia were almost exclusively filled by Protestants; that promotion in the army, in the administration, and even in legal offices was made not only exceedingly difficult, but, in some cases, actually unattainable by Catholics. Lastly, Pius IX. was not ignorant that whole Universities in Prussia were Protestant, and that not seldom funds, originally destined for the maintenance of institutions for Catholic education and instruction, were misappropriated. In spite of all this, the Pope repeatedly, readily, and gladly acknowledged that the Catholic Church in Prussia experienced the protection requisite for the fulfilment of her divine mission.

This was in the mind of the Pope when he spoke of a time of rest and tranquillity. The growth and development of the Church throughout the whole extent of the kingdom bore witness to the beneficent effects of this time of peace. On the other hand, not the slightest evidence was forthcoming that a spirit of true devotion to the Church was incompatible with fidelity to the king and the "fatherland." Attachment to the reigning House of Hohenzollern had grown up in the hearts of the Catholic population, and had taken root also in those Provinces which, for some time after their incorporation with Prussia, had kept aloof in an attitude of compulsory subjection.

We look in vain, therefore, for a pretext which might seem to call for a change in the relations between Church and State; on the contrary, everything seemed to speak of a continuance of their friendship; everything but this: the fear and dismay of Protestantism at the growth of the spiritual power of the Catholic Church. Now, the persecution of the Church in other—that is to say, in Catholic—countries, may generally be traced to the influence of Freemasonry and the infidelity with which it is associated. In Prussia, it is Protestantism in its numerous unlovely phases, from orthodox Lutheranism down to the shallowest form of Rationalism, which has created and fostered enmity to the Pope. The growth, too, of this enmity is to be accounted for by the circumstance that Protestants themselves were forced to admit that, should the Catholic

Church continue to make the sure though silent progress it had made during the past thirty years, the Protestant population might eventually succumb to her influence. In the strictly-orthodox Lutheran party, in spite of much hatred of the Pope, certain individual Catholic ordinances were beginning to be regarded more favourably. People felt more and more the contradiction contained in the expression of belief in an "invisible Church," and began to look eagerly for a divinely-instituted form of ecclesiastical government. Nothing was understood or admitted of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacraments, or of their efficacy *ex opere operato*; but keen disapproval was expressed of the definition of the Sacraments by the Reformers, as merely "a didactic and psychological, instead of a creative and miraculous agency."

The numerous body of Liberals in religion was unwilling to give up its connection with the "National Evangelical Church," though it had long since reduced *faith* to an absolute *subjective apprehension*. The clerical office was thereby deprived of any sort of significance; as to the exercise of any influence upon the masses, all question of it was gone, and it required no very keen insight into the position of affairs to recognise that the people were falling unchecked into infidelity or indifference.

What a mighty contrast to this was exhibited by the Catholic Church in her spiritual power! In face of the divisions of Protestantism, Cardinal Manning has lately said: "Never was there a time when the Church was more entirely and perfectly one—when pastors with their flocks, and both with their visible head and common Father, were more closely united than at the present moment." True, some time might yet elapse before, in this marvellous unity, Protestants should recognise the infallible sign of divine institution; but the eyes of the erring could not be for ever closed. The time *must* come when they would hail the light of Catholic truth the more surely, the more gladly, for the gross darkness of the precipice of unbelief yawning beneath their feet.

All this was instinctively felt by the official Protestantism of the country; hence the impulse to attack the Church long before the first announcement of open warfare. "It would soon be time to begin a Gustavus-Adolphus-like campaign with the Catholic Church, and ride boldly into her camp." Such were the words said to come from the lips of Frederick William IV. By the more moderate party, the weakness of the "Evangelical" Church was by no means ignored; they thought, however, that it would be comparatively easy to infuse new life into this Church by modifying its constitution and en-

larging its limits. In every case the universal conviction seemed to be that, now as formerly, the strength of the Prussian Constitution lay in the "National Evangelical Church." The one great obstacle in the way was the Catholic Church, with her claim to independence of the secular power; hence the idea whether it might be possible to compel her also to bow to the supremacy of the State, and to form a national religion. It might be that Catholicism would consent to yield something, in discipline if not in dogma, to the "Evangelical" Church, and thus all parties would be satisfied.

Meanwhile, the attack upon Catholicism was slowly preparing. The Liberal newspapers, in the interests of Freemasonry, had never lost an opportunity of throwing contempt upon the Church. The entire system of Protestant education tended in like manner to foster hatred towards Catholicism; every attempt, therefore, to check and oppress it was sure to meet with the sympathy of the non-Catholic population. It was evident that the moment for open conflict had arrived when the Government consented to an alliance with the National Liberals; an alliance eagerly sought by the latter, and which was consummated upon the decision by Prussia, in 1866, to drive Austria out of Germany, and to bring the remaining German States into dependence upon herself, at any cost.

As yet, however, the Prussian Government abstained from declaring open enmity with the Catholic Church, and declined to support the endeavours of the Liberals to suppress denominational schools and religious orders; it would probably, have been glad, for the present, if Bismark's policy had been supported by the Catholics of Prussia. The debates in the Diet in the years 1868 and 1869 gave ample proof of the hostile disposition of the Liberal party; but the Government still held aloof. It was the demeanour of the Bishops with reference to the Vatican Council which was the signal for active measures. Far-seeing politicians surmised at the time what has since been amply confirmed by published diplomatic papers, namely, that the ardent desire of the Cabinet of Berlin was to see the "non-opportunism" of the German Bishops carried to open rebellion against the Church and Pope. The attitude of the Ambassador, Count Arnim, during the Council, testifies to the existence of special designs on the part of his Government; Bismark's aim and object seemed to be the formation of a National Catholic Church of Prussia. But the greatest minds are liable to make inconceivable blunders when, without the knowledge and understanding requisite, they venture to meddle with the outward constitution of the Church. When the German Bishops, as their duty was, submitted to the

decision of the Council, the Government immediately supported, by every means in its power, those men of letters whose opposition to the dogma of infallibility developed at length into open schism. As early as the 30th of September, 1870, the Minister of Public Worship, Mühler, announced to the Academical Senate of the University of Bonn, that the Archbishop of Cologne was not empowered to exact from the Professors of Catholic Theology the recognition of the Vatican decrees. With the Bishop of Ermland the Minister dealt still more severely. The Bishop had suspended a theological teacher at Braunsberg for openly protesting against the decrees of the Council. It is evident to the simplest comprehension that the suspended priest had no further right to discharge his office as religious teacher; yet not only did the Minister protect him in that office, but he declared the suspension null and void. "The man," said Mühler, "had been regularly appointed, with the consent of the Church, and was teaching what he had always taught up to the 18th of July, 1870." This conduct on the part of Mühler was so flagrant an encroachment upon ecclesiastical rights that the Bishops of Prussia in a body made a formal complaint to the Emperor on the 7th of September, 1871. "The State," they protested, "is taking upon itself to determine Catholic questions of the highest import; we feel this to be a violation of the most sacred institutions of our faith, and a direct assault upon the rights of conscience, likely to result in a persecution of the bitterest and most dangerous kind." This protest was rejected as unjust and injurious; at the same time, however, the Government was compelled to promise that, for the future, in all measures affecting the Church, it would respect the united voice of the Episcopate. For some time before this, the Catholic laity had shown that they were aware of the dangers threatening their faith. Immediately after the political measures of December, 1868, the Catholics of all districts had protested strongly against any change in the "denominational" character of the primary schools; and when, in the following year, the question of suppressing religious orders assumed a dangerous aspect in the discussions of the Diet, an unanimous resolution was made to organise throughout the whole kingdom a distinct party for the defence of the Church. The delegates to the Diet were to be chosen from this party alone, and only after pledging themselves to observe the programme of their electors.

It seems that in the October of 1870 Bismark had announced that the favourable moment was at hand for a struggle with the Catholic Church. If such were in truth his declaration, it will readily be understood that nothing would be more distasteful to

him than the formation of the coalition of which we have just spoken. In its opposing force he was keen enough to foresee his most dangerous opponent, and an element of resistance to the formation of that "united German Empire," which was the darling project of the man who looked upon "blood and iron" as the best means for effecting the unity of the German races. Not devoid of a certain large-mindedness in his comprehension of things in their relative proportions, Bismark's habit was to follow out and develop his first impulses; the result of this policy generally tending to persuade him that his impulse was unerring. The task of carrying out any special project in detail had never been attractive to Bismark; but the labours necessitated by a thorough acquaintance with public life in Church and State were welcome to him, inasmuch as he considered himself capable of ruling events and of remodelling them according to his own will. In this spirit he determined to undertake forthwith, and with all his own peculiar energy, the conflict with "Ultramontanism," as soon as he seemed to perceive in it a power antagonistic to himself. Had he been better acquainted with the organisation of the Catholic Church he would have thought twice before pledging himself to a warfare which, in its ultimate results, turned out very differently from the expectations of the Protestant statesman. In fact, his entering so lightly upon a contest with the Church has deprived him for ever of claim to real historical greatness; in spite of the readiness of his like-minded contemporaries to bestow upon him, in the event of his success, the title of the "great creator of German unity."

Möhler, who prized his appointment as Minister of Public Worship, had done his utmost to go with the stream in the persecution of the Church. But as a leader he was useless. Accordingly, on the 12th of January, 1872, he received his dismissal. Ten days later witnessed the appointment as his successor of Privy Councillor Falk, who had hitherto been employed as Minister of Justice. His nomination was hailed with delight by the Liberals, who knew that Bismark had selected this Minister to act exclusively as Lieutenant-general to himself in the conflict with Rome.

In every case of warfare with the Church the first step has always been to check her influence over the minds of the young. The law of compulsory education, which was binding in Prussia, though the manner of complying with it had been as yet undefined, made it comparatively easy to keep the Church out of the schools. The Catholic population had grown accustomed to this law, because hitherto it had been under the control of Church authority. They had reckoned upon Prussia being

and remaining, always and at all times, a Christian State, and consequently had paid little heed to the warning that the prerogative of compulsory education would probably grow into the *monopoly* of education. It was a great mistake that hitherto the Church had not merely endured, but patronised the legislation of the State in the matter of education. The maxim that "the schools are exclusively State-institutions" should at once have been contradicted by ecclesiastical authority; whereas, the principle had been recognised for more than half a century. What was now to prevent the State from exercising a despotic sway over all educational institutions?

The new law with reference to school inspection was calculated to give full play to the exercise of this power. It handed over to the State the control over all educational establishments of every kind, whether public or private, and stipulated that all functionaries exercising the office of inspector should act strictly in accordance with the regulations of the State. On the 7th of February, 1872, the debate began in the Chamber of Deputies. The Bishops and Catholic people had protested by numerous petitions against the proposed law, which they felt to be an attack not only upon the rights of the Church but upon those of the family. The Liberal majority in the Parliament was as little disposed as the Government itself to give any heed to these representations. The members of the Catholic Defence party demonstrated clearly enough that the projected Act, in establishing a dictatorship over the schools, was in reality an infringement of the fundamental laws of the Constitution. Their representations were in vain, even though for a time, and up to a certain point, they were supported by the Protestant Conservatives. Bismark openly gave out that "the influence of the clergy in the schools must positively be checked." "The Catholic clergy," said the Chancellor, "are not nationally-minded; their sympathies are international, and they have far more at heart the prosperity of the Church than the development of German unity; they have set their faces against the formation of a Protestant Imperial Power." The assertions of the Chancellor took effect; the law was passed in both Chambers of the Diet, and on the 12th of March it received the formal sanction of the King.

The dangers now threatening the life of the Church were fully realised by the Bishops. True, the new Minister, Falk, had assured them that there would be but little change in the position of affairs, and that the superintendence of the schools would be now as formerly, with a few exceptions only, in the hands of the clergy. Sufficient reasons were not wanting for distrusting these fair promises. Amongst them was the dis-

missal, twelve months previously, of the Catholic division of the Ministry of Public Worship. It was not probable that the clerical inspectors of schools would retain their offices when members of the Ministry itself had fallen. Next followed the question whether, even if allowed to act, the Catholic clergy would be justified in so doing. Would it not be a recognition of the State claim to the monopoly of education? The Bishops were firm in maintaining that the Church possessed, independently of the State, the supreme right to direct and control all matters of instruction and education; and this right they felt themselves bound to defend and adhere to. On this head, in a general Pastoral addressed to the clergy, dated April 11th, they enjoined them, "to discharge with all fidelity, so long as it should be possible, their office as pastors of Christ's flock, especially with respect to the schools, now, by the recent unjust legislation, torn from their mother, the Holy Church." The Bishops resolutely and unanimously maintained their principle, although the majority of the Catholic inspectors were set aside, whilst those retained by the State were hampered by conditions to which extreme self-mastery alone could induce them to submit. The rapidity with which the work of deposing Catholic inspectors was prosecuted may be gathered from the fact that whereas in the year 1872 the cost of supplying secular inspectors was estimated at 60,000 marks, in 1879 it had amounted to nearly 900,000. Another proof of the persistent effort to check the influence of the clergy is furnished by the enactment, on the part of the Bavarian Minister, Lutz, of a penal statute on the "Abuse of the Pulpit," whereby every expression of disapproval of Government measures, in time of Divine service, was to be instantly checked.

The two above-mentioned laws were, then, the immediate signal for that open warfare which had for its sole aim and object the subjection of the divinely instituted Church of God to the will of a few Protestant statesmen and their willing coadjutors in the Prussian Parliament.

The Catholic Bishop of the Forces, Namszanowski, had prohibited the celebration of Divine service in one of the Old-Catholic churches at Cologne. Whereupon the Minister of War took upon himself to suspend the Bishop from his office. At the same time, a notice was issued to all the military chaplains, forbidding them, under pain of deprivation, to take any orders whatever from their ecclesiastical superior. As a pretext for this summary proceeding, it was alleged by the Government that, "in the army, two things only are recognised: to command and to obey; as to conditions, there are none, not even for the clergy."

Nothing short of the ineffable patience of the Church of God could have endured treatment such as this, without bidding her Ministers shake the dust from their feet, and leave the soldiers of Prussia to their fate. After a long delay, Bishop Namszanowski was summoned before a disciplinary tribunal, which, however, was forced to declare itself incapable of acting, inasmuch as the accused declined to be answerable to it. The Liberals were delighted, trusting that this conduct on the part of the Bishop would prepare the way for "complete deliverance from clerical insubordination." The Pope, with his accustomed clemency, decreed that henceforth the military chaplains should be subject to the Bishops of their respective dioceses.

Meanwhile, the first serious campaign against the religious orders had been opened. At the Old-Catholic Assembly, in the autumn of 1871, as well as at the meetings of the Protestant Union, the motion had been proposed and carried, to demand the expulsion of the Jesuits from the empire. Catholics looked on in amazement at the audacity with which men who had never belonged to the Church, or who had fallen from her ranks, now demanded the expulsion of good and conscientious priests who, *in no single point*, could be charged with violation of the laws of the State. Petitions, both in behalf of and against the Jesuits, appeared in great numbers at the Diet. As yet, it was uncertain what course would be taken by Bismark and the Assembly with regard to so flagrant a breach of the fundamental principles of Constitutional countries. The recent utterly illegal expulsion of foreign Jesuits from the provinces of Silesia and Posen gave room, however, for the supposition that if only a law could be passed to serve as a handle, the Government would deal as unfairly with its native subjects.

There was something almost ludicrous in the proposal of Bismark about this time to employ Cardinal Hohenlohe as Ambassador of the German Empire to the Holy See; it certainly was a signal defeat for the Chancellor to find his proposal rejected by the Pope. The Cardinal Secretary of State, Antonelli, announced, under date of the 2nd of May, 1872, to the German Consul, Herr von Derenthal, "that his Holiness felt with sincere regret that he could not authorise a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church to undertake so weighty and delicate a charge."

It was well-known at the Vatican that Bismark's object was to cause embarrassment to the Holy See; the Pope, however, cared little about questions of diplomacy. He calmly and simply pursued the course pointed out to him by his clear perception of the interests of the Church. In so far, however, as the Chancellor had aimed at arousing the animosity of the Emperor against the Pope, he cannot be said to have failed,

any shortcomings on his part being amply supplied by the exertions of the Liberals. Their real motives were clearly discernible through the veil of dissimulation by which they were concealed when, in the Diet of May 14th, Herr von Benningsen, with the consent of the Chancellor, declared that, "the manner in which the proposal of the Government had been treated at Rome was an insult, not to the Administration only, nor to the director of our foreign policy alone, but to a still higher power, namely, to the august head of the German Empire." Prince Bismark had thought well to speak somewhat more guardedly than did the head of the National Liberal party. He said that he would do his utmost "to induce his Imperial Majesty to find for the Court of Rome a representative of the German Empire who should be happy enough to possess the confidence of both parties." This, again, was merely a piece of political dissimulation, as is plainly manifested by the opening of the Chancellor's speech, when in words specially calculated to excite the susceptibilities of the Emperor, he declared, "I consider that, since the publication and promulgation of the Vatican decrees, it is no longer possible for the secular power to make a fresh Concordat with the Church, without being, to a certain extent, subordinate to the Church, a condition which the German Empire at least can never accept. Be assured of this that we will not go to Canossa, either in the ecclesiastical or political sense." This allusion, so pregnant with historical significancy, has lain like a stumbling-block in the way of every effort towards a better understanding on either side. Men of calmer judgment and more intimate acquaintance with the Church felt their attention aroused by this attitude of defiance. "These are bent, then, upon self-dependence," said Windthorst; "a grand idea truly, but which can never become a reality, except by keeping to one's own appointed sphere."

Two days later began the debate upon the expulsion of the Jesuits. Wagener, afterwards so unenviably distinguished in the conflict, spoke with great bitterness against the Society of Jesus. Bismark had already expressed his approval of the motion to be proposed by Wagener; and was, therefore, fully prepared for the petition drawn up by the Protestant majority in the Diet, begging him "to take into consideration the formation of a law which should regulate the position of religious orders and congregations, and which should control, by means of penal statutes, the dangerous political influence of the Jesuits." The Catholics of the Empire knew well enough the work upon which the Diet was engaged; they would have considered it more honourable on the part of Bismark had he not prompted its decisions; nay, more than that, actually pre-arranged his

own course of action. By the 11th of June the project had been accepted; so accustomed had the Parliament become to ignoring the rights of citizens, and to enacting what would have been defined by itself as an "infringement upon the liberties of individuals." The object to be gained by the laws against the Jesuits was doubtful. True, Bismark had given out that "the empire was involved in warlike relations with Rome;" it could scarcely, however, be imagined that Rome would collapse upon the expulsion from the empire of a couple of hundred Jesuits. The Government hoped, perhaps, by the banishment of these individuals to get rid at the same time of the spirit which animated them. There could be no greater mistake. The entire Catholic people were of the mind of Windthorst when, addressing the rash disturbers of the nation's peace, he said: "We hear that it is becoming a question of war to the knife with us; we, on our part, are desirous of peace, but if you insist upon war, why, then, you shall have it." The Catholics of Prussia were true to their word.

It was idle for the Administration to protest that "no hostility was intended towards the Catholic Church." The conviction in every Catholic heart, from the highest to the lowest, tended in an opposite direction, and, in this conviction, all were prepared to sacrifice both property and life in defence of their religion.

The intentions of the Government were soon, however, announced in unmistakable terms by the Chancellor; "with reference to the pretensions brought forward by certain subjects of the empire, belonging to the ecclesiastical state, that laws have been passed which were not binding upon them, we declare that the unconditional sovereignty of the State will be upheld by all the means in our power." These were the words of Bismark. Falk, also, in a letter to the Bishop of Ermland, asserted that the Catholic Church in Prussia, like "all other corporations, is subject to the legislation of the State." Now, every Catholic child knows perfectly well that this statement is opposed to the first principles of its religion. The Church never has been, and never can be, subject to State legislation; because, founded by the Son of God Himself, she is in her constitution, as in her existence, immediately dependent upon Almighty God. Had the statesmen of Prussia comprehended this, they would not have been guilty of the folly of attempting to make the law of God subservient to the law of man. Here, again, as in so many other instances, the arrogance of Protestantism led men to imagine that they had but to lay hands upon the Catholic Church and her ruin would be accomplished.

Whilst the Secular Power was determined to make unlimited use of its means of oppressing the Church, the Bishops, on their

part, were resolved to maintain intact their lawful prerogatives, and to yield only to open and direct force. Falk might protect and retain in their offices suspended and excommunicated professors; but he was powerless to ward off from them the consequences of excommunication. In like manner, he could deprive of his temporal revenues the Bishop who, in obeying the Church, was disobedient to the State; he could not prevent that Bishop from telling him plainly "we must obey God rather than men." Again, by the decree of the 15th of June, 1872, the Minister was able, in defiance of all right and equity, to deprive members of religious orders and congregations of their office as instructors of the young; he could not prevent Catholic parents from inculcating the principles which the Prussian Administration sought to stamp out by banishing the religious orders. In short, the Minister could pull down and destroy—heap ruin upon ruin—but he could set up nothing in place of this devastation. Every fresh shock was met by the open opposition of the clergy, or by the silent yet profound and effective aversion of the Catholic laity.

As a proof of the trifling details to which the Government descended, may be mentioned the order for the exclusion of the Marists, and of the very unostentatious "Association of Prayer," from the Gymnasiums.

The outbreak of the persecution had been contemplated with heartfelt sorrow by Pope Pius IX. By the light wherewith God enlightens his devoted servants he had realised the true character of this persecution, and now, with the courage of an Apostle, he fearlessly pronounced upon it the sentence of condemnation. On the 24th of June the Pope gave audience at Rome to the "German Reading Society," and received an address from its members. In replying, the Holy Father said:—

As touching the persecution which has now broken out in your country, I bid you oppose to it the weapon of prayer. Make use also of the Press and of occasions of public speaking, for the steadfast maintenance of your principles, and do so with circumspection and resolution. We have to deal with a persecution which, after long preparation, has at length openly manifested itself. At its head stands the Prime Minister of a mighty empire, flushed with recent triumphs in the field. Success used immoderately, however, is of short duration, and victory which would celebrate its triumphs by fighting against truth and the Church is simply madness.

The word of solemn warning added by the illustrious Pontiff called down upon him much abuse; he merely said, however, "Let us trust in God; who knows if the little stone cut out from the mountain may not shortly break in pieces the feet of

the Colossus." He meant that the Church ought confidently to hope and believe that in His good time God would come to her aid, and that if in no other way her deliverance could be accomplished, it would be effected by the annihilation of her enemies. An entire disbelief in the judgment of God in His dealings with the world could alone find in these words of the Pope more than a simple, though austere, expression of this confidence.

In the publication of the law against the Jesuits, on the 4th of July, the Liberal newspapers rejoiced to see, as they imagined, a retaliation upon the Pope. The mind of the Catholic people was expressed in the declaration issued by the newly-formed "Catholic Union of Germany": "In opposition to the formal wishes of the head of the German nation certain factions in the State have thrown down the gauntlet in the face of the Catholic Church, taking as their watchword, warfare against the institutions of that Church, and hereby sowing the seeds of hatred and disunion throughout the Empire." The law against the Jesuits was put into execution with urgent haste, and was extended also to the province of Alsace-Lorraine even before the sanction of the Emperor, on that point, had been obtained. By the Prussian Ministers of the Interior and of Public Worship the extraordinary announcement was made that, independently of the Jesuit Order itself, congregations existed which were "affiliated with" it. On the 10th of August, 1872, the local governors were required to find out whether the Redemptorists, Christian Brothers, Lazarists, Barnabites, Theatines, or Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, possessed establishments in their districts. It was easy to infer that for these Societies also the hour of dissolution had arrived. As for the Jesuits, the law against them was so rigorously and summarily enforced that not once again were the Fathers allowed to hear confessions, or say Mass in any of the parish churches. The liveliest interest was shown by the whole Catholic population in the fate of these much-esteemed priests; in every place where institutions of the Order existed the most heartfelt sympathy with the Fathers was manifested; occasionally, indeed, these demonstrations assumed a character which, had it not been for the strife-appeasing words of the Jesuits themselves, would probably have developed into open rebellion against the law.

One more attempt was made to compel the Bishop of Ermeland to an absolute recognition of the supremacy of the State. On the occasion of the rejoicings at Marienburg, in celebration of the union of West Prussia with the Kingdom, the Bishop was desirous of offering his homage to the Emperor. His Majesty declined, however, to receive the Address until the

Bishop should express himself ready to obey the laws of the State in their complete significance. In a statement of the 5th of September, 1872, the Bishop declared that, "willingly and unreservedly he would acknowledge the supreme authority of the State in secular matters;" but that in "questions of the Faith, and of eternal salvation, his submission was due to the authority of that Church which had been founded by Almighty God Himself, and which was directed by His Holy Spirit." This reply was deemed unsatisfactory; hence no further doubt could be entertained that what was required of the Catholic Church was its unconditional subjection to the State. One would imagine that, even to the Protestant mind, the inadmissibility of such a claim would be evident; from the Catholic point of view it was, of course, nothing less than a demand for rejection of Almighty God in favour of the State.

The Bishops of Germany placed themselves, to a man, on the side of the Bishop of Ermland; and in a memorial signed at Fulda on the 20th of September, they declared that "he had acted with due appreciation of the prerogatives committed to him; in a similar case we should have done as he has done." In the same memorial the Bishops insisted upon the freedom and independence of religious orders, and the necessity of the Church's exercising due influence over Catholic schools. Finally, the Bishops declared that "they would ever take as their rule of conduct the maxims of the Catholic Church, and that for those maxims they were ready to make the greatest sacrifices." Falk seemed to put little faith in the sincerity of this protestation, otherwise he would have spared himself the trouble of attempting to bring the Bishop of Ermland to bow to his authority as Minister by threatening to withdraw the temporalities of his See. The attempt was a complete failure. Bishop Kremmz, however, whilst insisting upon the disinterestedness of the Bishops, pointed out that their payment by the State for expenses incurred in its service was a simple *obligation*.

Further attempts of the Administration, at that time, to oppress the Church were, without exception, frustrated. It was to be expected, however, as the Official Press took care to announce, that other and sharper measures would be resorted to. The *Provinzial Correspondenz* of the 15th of October, 1872, announced that "There was no room for further doubt that the Bishops had, unconditionally and unreservedly, surrendered themselves to the will of the Roman Curia." A fresh system of legislation with reference to the Catholic Church was set in motion; its announcement was speedily carried into effect.

ART. VI.—GUNPOWDER AND MODERN WARFARE.

1. *Notes on Gunpowder and Gun Cotton.* By Major W. H. WARDELL, R.A. Printed by order of the Secretary of State for War.
2. *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution.* 1863–1879. London: Mitchell & Co.

SOME miles to the north-east of London there once stood the Abbey of Waltham; it dated back to Saxon times, though it was not then a monastic, but a secular foundation. The unfortunate King Harold himself rebuilt or enlarged the church, and established there a dean and eleven canons. It is said that he stayed and worshipped here just before the Battle of Hastings; and it was here that his body was brought for interment after that fatal day. In Henry II.'s reign regular canons of the order of St. Augustine took the place of the seculars; and so they continued till the house was seized by Henry VIII., and met a similar end to that of so many other religious houses. No portion of the monastery exists excepting a gateway and part of a wall; but the nave of the church escaped destruction, and is still standing. It has been repaired at various times, but the old Saxon architecture of the central part of the building remains to this day, a glorious monument of the past. Not very far from the same spot stands Waltham Cross, erected by Edward I. to the memory of his wife, Queen Eleanor, and bearing her statue in one of its niches. It is a beautiful remnant of mediæval times, and there are few such to be found.

Close to the site of the Abbey, however, there is something of a far different kind. This is a large enclosure of above fifty acres, containing within it a number of buildings, in which various symptoms, such as a chimney in one place, or a strong odour in another, make it evident that some process of manufacture is being carried on.

Such places are not usually agreeable to the senses, yet here you have walks planted with trees; you have the little river Lee running through the grounds, and several artificial water-courses; in one field the willow-trees are so planted that they present a regular and symmetrical form to the eye from whatever point you look at them; and certainly it is a pleasant scene that meets the view. But out of this fair and peaceful spot issues the agent of devastation and death—for it is the Government Powder Factory, in which is made almost all the gunpowder, as well as all the gun-cotton, used in our military

and naval services. The willow-trees are for making charcoal, willow-charcoal being specially good for the purpose ; but the planting of trees (poplars and others) on the banks between the different mills has another advantage, in tending to lessen the concussion in case of an explosion. The canals could flood a portion of the works, if required, in the event of a catastrophe, but their principal use is to act as water-ways for the powder from one part of the works to another ; and the river Lee conveys it away to Woolwich or elsewhere, as soon as may be, after it is ready. Every possible precaution is adopted within these precincts to avoid mischief, for some of the operations are necessarily hazardous. So scrupulous, in fact, is the care taken that, on entering several of the mills, every one is compelled to put on large leather goloshes, lest a nail in the sole of the shoe should strike a spark, and cause an explosion ; and notwithstanding all this, accidents on a small scale do occasionally happen.

There is no great mystery in the art of making gunpowder ; but since, from the nature of it, it cannot be thrown open to the gaze of the public generally, a brief description of the process may, perhaps, prove not uninteresting.

Gunpowder is made of saltpetre, charcoal, and sulphur ; and the proportions of these ingredients by weight are, in English Government powder, 75 per cent. of saltpetre, 15 of charcoal, and 10 of sulphur. On the Continent the proportions are in some small degree different.*

The saltpetre is imported from India, where it is a natural product of the soil. On the Continent it is, to a great extent, made artificially ; but we in England get it in abundance from India ; and it has been supposed that the circumstance of its being so abundant in that country was the reason why gunpowder was discovered there at so early a date. The first process is to purify it from foreign matter mixed up with it ; and the next is to reduce it to a powder by grinding it in a mill. The sulphur is brought principally from Sicily ; it has also to be purified and reduced to powder. The charcoal is made chiefly from willow-wood, as already stated ; but some is made from logwood, which is best for the finer kind of powder. It is chiefly prepared by distillation in large iron retorts, and is pulverized in a machine something like a coffee-mill. These three ingredients, having been first sifted, are duly proportioned by weight, and are then mixed together. The next step is what is termed "incorporating ;" this is done in a mill where

* In France and Belgium the charcoal is 12·5 per cent., and the sulphur the same.

a very heavy pressure is exercised by runners of cast-iron or stone, and the powder (which is moistened with distilled water) has thus the particles of each portion of the composition forced into most intimate union. It is pressed by this machine into a solid substance, which is called "mill-cake." This, it may well be understood, is an operation involving some risk; and at Waltham factory a drenching apparatus is arranged over each mill, so as to flood the bed of the mill, and, indeed, of the whole group of mills simultaneously, in case of an explosion. The mill-cake is afterwards "broken down," as it is termed, by a machine fitted with grooved metal rollers, which converts it into meal; but it is again taken to be reconverted into mill-cake, or "press-cake," as it may more correctly be called, in another machine worked by hydraulic pressure. It is now a more perfect and more densely-pressed cake than it was before the "breaking-up" process. It comes out in layers of different thickness (regulated by the press-machine), and in this state it is broken into pieces, before the next process, for some of the finer powders, not, however, for the other and coarser sorts.

The next step, and a most important one, is called "granulating." It is performed by three or four pairs of rollers made of gun-metal, some of which have teeth cut according to the size of grain required, others being toothless. The powder is thus reduced in some cases to the smallest grains, and in others is made into large pieces, which are used for artillery purposes strictly so called, the small-grained powder being used for rifles and pistols. But there is another kind of powder, which is now in use, which deserves special mention, and which is called "pebble powder." It is, in fact, cut either by machinery or by hand into large cakes; some of the size of a cubic inch or thereabouts; some of nearly double that size; some of $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch cubes. These are intended for loading heavy ordnance—the "Woolwich Infants," and such monster guns.

After these operations, the smaller kinds of powder are "dusted." And all the kinds are then glazed, the small-grained powders by friction (in the glazing barrels), and the large-grained by the addition of the purest graphite, a substance popularly known as black lead. The powder is then taken to the drying house (heated by steam-pipes), and spread on shelves; after it is dry it is put into horizontal reels, making rapid revolutions, and this process removes the dust which follows on the drying, and also imparts a final glaze or "colour," as it is termed. Lastly it is put into wooden barrels, and is taken away as soon as it conveniently can be from Waltham Abbey.

Such is the history of the manufacture of gunpowder as it is made for the British service.

But what is the reason why this powder, so apparently innocent, and really so harmless until a spark touches it, produces such deadly effects? Those whose pursuits lead them in other directions may possibly not be displeased if some explanation is here given of this. The action of gunpowder depends, as is the case with other explosive substances, on certain chemical affinities being brought into play. We have seen that it is composed of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal. The two latter are simple elements, but saltpetre is a compound substance, and in chemical nomenclature is called nitrate of potassium—that is, it is formed by the union of three elements, nitrogen, oxygen, and the metal potassium. But the affinity of oxygen for carbon (that is, its natural tendency to combine with it) is greater than its affinity for potassium; while, on the other hand, the affinity of sulphur for potassium is considerable. Supposing, then, that a mixture of these three substances (saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal) in proper proportions is heated sufficiently to bring their affinities into play, the oxygen which was in the saltpetre unites with the carbon of the charcoal, and forms carbonic acid gas; the nitrogen is set free, and the potassium (the remaining element in the saltpetre) unites with the sulphur, and forms sulphate of potash; a certain proportion of carbonate of potash is also formed, and a proportion of carbonic oxide. But the main explosive powers are the carbonic acid and nitrogen gases. The other substances remain for the most part in a state at first liquid, but almost immediately afterwards solid, in the mouth of the gun, *fouling* it until means are taken to remove them. To show how all this comes about, it may be observed that in a cubic foot of saltpetre the potassium occupies about seven-eighths of the bulk, and the oxygen and nitrogen gases are condensed by the force of chemical attraction into a space of one-eighth of a cubic foot—that is, in its cool and ordinary state. But the heat of explosion breaks the bonds of union, and sets the gases free, on which they forthwith expand into a volume calculated (in “Hyde’s Gunnery”) to be 7776 times what it was under the pressure of the atmosphere and in its former state, and therefore exerting in all directions a pressure equivalent (as it is termed) to 7776 atmospheres.* There is some

* Major Wardell gives the following as the chemical equation, but he says that the decomposition is so complicated, that it is impossible to represent it accurately by any single equation. K is the metal potassium; O is oxygen; N nitrogen; C carbon; S sulphur.

$4\text{KNO}_3 + \text{C}_4 + \text{S} = (\text{after explosion}) \text{K}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{CO}_2 + \text{K}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{SO}_3 + \text{N}_4 + 2\text{CO}_2 + \text{CO}.$
 CO_2 is carbonic acid; $\text{K}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{CO}_2$ is carbonate of potash; SO_3 is sulphuric acid; CO is carbonic oxide.

difficulty in estimating this accurately, and different experimentalists give different figures. Major Wardell, assistant-superintendent of the Royal Gunpowder Factory, in whose little book, called "Notes on Gunpowder and Gun-cotton," there is much useful information, reckons that the gases evolved would (if entirely filling the close vessel in which the powder is supposed to be exploded) give a pressure of about 6000 atmospheres, or about forty tons to the square inch. But this would vary with the temperature of the air, and the barometric pressure, as well as other circumstances. At any rate we see that on the explosion of powder an enormous development of gases takes place, and at a very high temperature (calculated by some modern experimentalists at 4000° Fahrenheit); and the result is a tremendous pressure *in all directions*. We know from the familiar sound which is heard on the opening of a champagne bottle what force carbonic acid gas has even in a small quantity, and when cold; so it may be imagined what it must have when present in great quantity and heated to a very high temperature.

The two gases, then, carbonic acid and nitrogen, press violently in every way, forward, and so driving out the projectile from the gun; backward, and so making the gun recoil; and on all sides, thus straining the weapon, and making it burst if badly constructed. Such is the action of gunpowder. It may be observed that sulphur, though very serviceable, is not an absolutely essential ingredient; it combines readily with the potassium, and so is very useful, also it is a very inflammable substance and helps to ignite the powder.

It remains to say a few words about gun-cotton. The manufacture of it is simple enough. Common cotton (duly cleaned and picked) is soaked in sulphuric and nitric acid. After it has been thus soaked, it is curious to see what great trouble is taken to wash off the acids; if this were not done, it would be such a violent explosive as to be quite unsafe. But by dint of several processes, the centrifugal-wringing machine, the immersing machine, and the boiling by steam, the uncombined acid is got rid of, and the cotton remains apparently unchanged (except in weight), but really having undergone a chemical change of the greatest importance. It should be observed that here again it is the nitric, rather than the sulphuric acid which does the work; the latter, however, has a great attraction for water, and so facilitates the chemical process by which gun-cotton is formed. The principle of it is, that since the cotton consists of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, a portion of the hydrogen is replaced by a corresponding amount of nitric peroxide, which latter consists of nitrogen and oxygen

in very feeble combination ; the new compound thus formed is in an unstable state of chemical equilibrium, and it explodes much more easily than gunpowder ; the products of the explosion are carbonic oxide, carbonic acid, aqueous vapour, and nitrogen.

Gun-cotton is not used for artillery purposes, being a less convenient agent for these than powder, nor indeed (in our own service) for military small arms. It is, however (after being made up into compressed cakes), used for mining and also for torpedoes. It is, in fact, more violent in its action than gunpowder, and so serves well for the last-named objects. It is sometimes used for cartridges for sporting guns, and has the advantage of causing very little recoil ; the reason of which is that its action is so rapid that the effect is chiefly expended on the metal of the gun and the projectile before the inertia is overcome. The explosion is not attended with smoke.

There is an old proverb that fire and water are very good servants but very bad masters ; and the same may be truly said of gunpowder. What sort of master it is the accidents, rare in occurrence, but terrible in result, which happen from time to time can abundantly testify ; but it certainly is the most tractable and obedient of servants. Among many explosive substances it is pre-eminent for one or two valuable qualities. In the first place, though it seems to a bystander to go off violently and instantaneously, yet the ignition is really gradual, particularly in the huge cartridges made up of large-grained powder, or pebble powder, which are used for heavy ordnance ; and the shock of the discharge, violent though it appears, is yet not too violent, and consequently the strain on the gun is not too great. Besides this, there is a regularity about its action. You can calculate that if a given charge of powder produces certain results, an increased charge will produce certain other results in due proportion.

It has just been mentioned that there are many other explosives besides gunpowder ; one of these, viz., gun-cotton, has been already explained. Another, and a very formidable one, is nitro glycerin, which is formed from glycerin by treating it with a mixture of concentrated nitric and sulphuric acids, as gun-cotton is made in a similar way from common cotton. It is about the most powerful explosive substance known that can be made use of practically ; and it is so dangerous in a liquid state that it is usually mixed with a certain absorbent substance, a silicious earth (called in German "*Kieselguhr*"), which can absorb about three times its own weight of nitro glycerin ; this mixture is called dynamite. It is used a good deal in this shape for military purposes by foreign nations.

Chloride and iodide of nitrogen are two explosive compounds, so violent as to be practically useless.

And there are several others which are for the same reason confined to the laboratory of the experimental chemist, being unavailable for any practical purpose.

Fulminate of mercury is most useful as a detonating substance; it is produced by the action of alcohol upon a solution of mercury in nitric acid; it is very sensitive to percussion, and so is very serviceable for the copper caps used to explode cartridges for small arms, and also for the detonating powder put into some kinds of fuzes.

Fulminate of silver, on the other hand, is too sensitive, and is, therefore, little, if at all, employed.

A mixture of chloride of potash and black sulphide of antimony is used for what are termed friction tubes, by which guns (that is, all pieces of ordnance used as artillery) are fired; it acts as a very good detonator, and serves also for other purposes.

Gunpowder is, after all, the best and most available of propelling agents. Before alluding to its introduction into warfare, and the modern methods of applying it, a few words may be said on the science of gunnery.

Gunnery, as we shall presently see, was treated scientifically two hundred and three hundred years ago; but in the present age, as it may naturally be supposed, matters of this kind have been more fully investigated, and the knowledge of them more extensively spread.

All persons who are at all acquainted with the subject are aware that the path of a projectile *in vacuo*, that is, when acted upon merely by the original propelling force and by that of gravity, is the well-known curve called a parabola; a simple mathematical formula indicates the course described by the projectile under such conditions, and (supposing it to be projected at some angle of elevation) it may easily be shown that the mid-way point in the curve is the vertex of the parabola, and also that the greatest range can be obtained when the projectile is shot off at an angle of 45° . The parabolic theory, however, does not hold good in nature, for it omits to take account of a most powerful factor, the resistance of the air. At the same time it must be said that projectiles which are propelled at a low velocity do not deviate very considerably from the parabola in the curve which they trace. Any one who has walked about forts or places where ordnance are kept must have remarked the short squat pieces called mortars, intended to throw large spherical shells at a high elevation so as to drop down into the enemy's works; these are fixed at an angle of 45° or thereabouts, and the shells when shot from them describe

something approaching to a parabola. But when we come to projectiles driven from out of the muzzle of a gun at a velocity of 1600 feet per second, or even much less, the resistance of the air is so great that the shape of the curve is completely altered, and the range very greatly reduced. Thus, shots have been projected from modern guns to distances of five and six miles; if fired under the same conditions in other respects, but in a place where there was no atmosphere, they would have ranged at from twenty to twenty-five miles.* And not only is there the resistance of the air to disturb the calculation, but this resistance is itself a varying quantity, depending on the velocity of the projectile; and it does not even vary according to any clearly defined law; nor does it even always steadily increase as the velocity increases. In fact, it defies accurate calculation.† But where the mathematician fails, the experimental artilleryman succeeds; and by dint of repeated trials the ranges for different shot or shell fired from various guns are found and tabulated, and rules are given to guide the gunner in laying his gun and taking his aim. It is curious to watch the curve made by a shot fired from a good rifled gun, which you can partially do, and to see how it rises up in the air, and yet how accurately it descends upon or near to the target, if the gun is properly laid. And though mathematics cannot trace this curve, yet in many other points connected with artillery that great science is brought to bear. It would be uninteresting and tedious to put these before the general reader; but there is one thing sufficiently remarkable to bear noticing. In determining the probable effect of a projectile upon an object you calculate the *energy* (as it is termed) in the shot at the moment of impact, and you have to consider its weight and its *final* velocity, and also the force of gravity (which is constant). Now the effect will increase in a simple ratio according as the shot is greater in weight, but it increases in proportion to the *square* of its final velocity. Thus, if one shot is twice as heavy as another (the remaining conditions being the same) it will do twice the work. But if it be of the same weight, and yet fall on the object with twice

* This is true as a general rule; but Sir William Armstrong states that at certain low elevations, not exceeding 6°, the range of an *elongated* projectile is greater in the atmosphere than it would be in *vacuo*. The reason he gives is that the projectile acquires a continually increasing obliquity to the curve of its flight, and is therefore in a measure supported by the air, as a kite is supported by the current of air meeting its inclined surface, and so its descent is retarded.

† Some recent investigations appear to show that the resistance of the air varies at a power of from about 2·1 to 2·4—rather more than the square of the velocity of the projectile.

the velocity of the other, then it will do *four* times the work.*

Before quitting this part of the subject, it may be observed that the loss of velocity which the projectile undergoes in its flight is entirely due to the resistance of the atmosphere. All persons who are acquainted with mechanics are well aware there is no such thing as a force *spending itself out*, but that a body propelled in any direction by a given force would go on forever in that direction unless some other force intervened. If you could fire off a gun in a perfect vacuum, you would have nothing but the force of gravity to interfere with the original projecting force; and gravity would act by gradually bringing down the shot to the ground, not by checking its speed; indeed it would even cause an increase of velocity before the shot touched the earth, if it were fired from a highly elevated position. And thus the projectile would eventually strike the object aimed at, or the ground as the case might be, with at least the same velocity as it had when it left the cannon's mouth. If it could be fired in a horizontal direction from the top of a lofty mountain, at such a velocity as five miles in a second (which, of course, is not really practicable), it would never touch the ground at all, owing to the curvature of the earth's surface, but would pass clear round the earth and then come back to the point from which it started, and (if nothing stopped it) would go on again and again like a small satellite.

If a shot were fired vertically upwards, it would come down again on nearly the same spot with exactly the same velocity with which it started. This last rule holds good in nature, even with the resistance of the air, and whatever velocity a shot fired straight upwards loses from the action of gravity, it regains in its descent. A fatal accident occurred a year or two ago, at a place where some volunteers were practising rifle-shooting, from ignorance of this law.

Gunpowder has had so vast an influence in changing the face of warfare, that it is instructive to recall its past history and the time and mode of its appearance on the battle-field. To begin with a scene from the Middle Ages.

On the 26th August, 1346, was fought the battle of Crécy. The English army of about 30,000 men (including 10,000 archers) was commanded by King Edward III. The French

* The work = $\frac{w v^2}{2 g}$ when w = weight of projectile.
 v = final velocity.
 g = force of gravity = 32.2 feet.

army, 120,000 in number (as was said), was commanded by Philip VI., King of France. The English were victorious, defeating an army four times as large as their own. Nor, indeed, was this all; for the third line, under King Edward in person, was never engaged. When the Black Prince (at that time a mere stripling), who was in command of the first line, was somewhat hard pressed by the French, Edward III. was requested to send him assistance, and refused to do so, on the ground that he wished his youthful son to have the undivided honour of gaining the victory.

Edward the Black Prince
Who on the French ground played a tragedy,
Making defeat on the full power of France,
While his most mighty father on a hill
Stood smiling, to behold his lion's whelp
Forage in blood of French nobility.
O noble English! that could entertain
With half their forces the full pride of France,
And let another half stand laughing by,
All out of work, and cold for action!

Henry V., Act I. scene 2.

It appears that the loss on the French side was enormous, including 1200 knights, 1400 gentlemen, 4000 men-at-arms, and 30,000 of inferior rank; many of the principal nobility of France fell, including the Count d'Alençon, brother of the king.

To account for this, it may be said that the English stood on the defensive (as they have often successfully done since then), their position was well chosen and entrenched on the flanks. The French came up to the attack in imperfect formation, and fatigued by marching. The Genoese cross-bowmen (on whom great reliance was placed for the attack) had had the strings of their bows moistened by a thunder shower, and their arrows fell short; while the English archers, taking their bows out of their cases (which kept them dry during the rain), used their weapons effectively, as English archers always did.

Still this was not all. The English had placed in front of their line four engines of war of somewhat clumsy construction (probably long strips of iron hooped together), which were called bombards or guns. These guns discharged stones or leaden balls, which were propelled by the firing of a substance then somewhat recently introduced into Europe but now well-known as gunpowder. There is no doubt that these guns were used at Crécy (though some say there were three and some four

of them); they are mentioned in a manuscript of Froissart, which, we are told, is preserved in the library of Amiens; it is there said that "The English caused to fire suddenly certain guns which they had in the battle, to astonish (or confound) the Genoese."

This statement is confirmed by Vilani, the Florentine historian, and also by a passage in the chronicles of St. Denis. It appears that the French king had also some guns, which in his hurried march he left behind!

Curiously enough, Froissart in his well-known chronicles, though he gives a detailed account of the battle, says nothing about the guns. He tells us that Edward III. and the Black Prince heard Mass and received the Holy Communion on that eventful Saturday morning; he mentions the haste and disorder of the attacking force, and the disinclination of the Genoese to go into action, also the thunderstorm which preceded the battle (which commenced about 4 P.M.). He tells how the king of France, seeing the confusion into which the Genoese were thrown, gave orders to kill that "ribaudaille," thereby increasing the confusion; and he narrates fully the incident of the message sent to Edward III., asking for aid from the third line (then in reserve) for the first and second which were hard pressed; and he informs us that Edward's reply so stirred up the spirit of the Black Prince and those around him, that they fought better than ever and gained the day.

How are we to account for nothing being here said of the execution done by the guns? The answer probably is that they played a part in the events of the day, subordinate in one respect, and most important in another; they produced a small physical but a vast moral effect. On this head may be quoted a few observations from some interesting essays on the "Mobility of Field Artillery," by Capt. Hime, R.A. After stating that cavalry had about this time (that is the time of the battle of Crécy) "exchanged their hauberks for plate-armour, which was proof against pointed swords, lance-thrusts, and battle-axes," and that the chief strength of the English army lay then, as it always has done, in its infantry; and after explaining that various circumstances, the weakness of the powder, the feebleness of the guns, and the difficulty of moving them from place to place, made it difficult for the new arm to cope successfully with the then existing "men-at-arms." Captain Hime continues as follows:—

The effect it (*i.e.*, the said *new arm*) produced, however, was sufficient to ensure its retention in the English service, and its adoption in all others. It killed few, no doubt; but it terrified many. Its physical

effect was small ; but its moral effect was great, and *à la guerre tout est moral* ("Pensées de Napoléon I."). Indeed, the essential difference between ancient and modern warfare, tactically considered, lies in the vast importance which the invention of gunpowder at once conferred upon moral force. Moral force had always exerted an influence, and occasionally a great influence in war, but this "mischievous discovery" (Gibbons's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire") heightened its importance in an extraordinary degree. The battles of ancient times were, in the majority of cases, of the Horatii and Curiatii type. The hostile forces met, a prolonged and desperate struggle took place, physical strength prevailed, the weaker fell, and the battle ended. . . . The mere possession of strength entitled a man to universal respect, and the story of Hercules was so popular that no less than forty vagabonds successfully assumed the character at different periods of the world's history. But the race of blind force was run when gunpowder was discovered ; the chemical mixture which the monk [he means Roger Bacon] stumbled upon in the solitude of the cloisters, gave the victory to mind over matter in war ; and the introduction of artillery gradually revolutionized tactics. The guns could be loaded but slowly, it is true, and few of the shots struck the mark ; but when the fatal ball did enter the ranks of the enemy, death followed in its wake. No courage could avail against it, no armour was proof against it, and it acted from distances which the strongest archers could not reach. But it was not the destruction which it actually caused, it was the destruction which men felt it *might* cause, that constituted the chief element of its strength. The startling results, which it produced so rapidly, so suddenly, so unexpectedly, acted upon their imaginations. The deafening noise of the discharge, the blinding smoke which accompanied it, wrought upon their fears. The bravest blanched when he saw some splendid knight, some stalwart man-at-arms, whom it would have required long hours and overwhelming numbers to overcome and slaughter with battle-axes and maces, struck down as it were by a thunderbolt.*

The battle of Crécy has been dwelt upon because it seems to have been the first occasion, at least in Europe, when artillery was used *in the field* : but it had been used previously for siege purposes. Edward III. had himself employed certain engines, called by a contemporary writer "crakeys of war," in his campaign against the Scots in 1327. And about the same time guns were introduced into the English naval service.† Artillery

* Hime's "Mobility of Field Artillery," chap. 1.

† It appears that in 1338 there were among the stores of the hulk, *Christopher of the Tower of London*, three iron cannons with five chambers, and in the barge, *Marie de la Tour*, one iron gun with two chambers, and a brass one with one chamber. A *chamber*, as it is called in modern guns, means that part of the bore which, when the gun is loaded, contains the charge of powder, and is smaller in diameter than the rest of the bore, being in fact somewhat conical in shape.

is said to have been used by the Moors in Spain against Saragossa in 1118. Again, in 1280, it was employed against Cordova; subsequently it seems to have come into more general use in Spain, and that before it was adopted by the rest of Europe; this was probably owing to the Moors.

But for the earliest knowledge of gunpowder we must go to the far East. The Chinese were acquainted with it hundreds of years before it was known in Europe. The date at which they discovered it is unknown, but it is supposed that they used some similar compound before the Christian era, and applied it in rockets and shells of some kind or other to warlike purposes: and the same is supposed of the Hindoos, but gunpowder was not used for *throwing projectiles* until a much later period.* Guns are said to have been constructed in China in 757 A.D. for this latter purpose; and it is stated in some Chinese writings that a gun was in use in that country so far back as 618 B.C. (under the Taing-off dynasty), and that it bore the inscription, "I hurl death to the traitor, and extermination to the rebel." But whether the Chinese had or had not guns as far back as the Christian era, or six hundred years earlier (which is of course open to doubt), it is certain that they were employing them extensively about the commencement of the thirteenth century. The early history of this nation is involved in some obscurity, and it may be left to those who are interested in them and who are learned in their language and literature, to discover at what date they invented artillery, and what effect the invention had upon the consolidation of their empire in Eastern Asia. Two things are, however, certain—first, that the Chinese were acquainted with gunpowder and its applicability to throwing projectiles several centuries before it was known in Europe; and, secondly, that they did *not* conquer the world.

So, again, we find that it was in use in India at a very remote date. There is a legendary story that in the wars of the Egyptian Hercules in that country when a certain stronghold was attacked, the sages who defended it repulsed the attack

Guns can be made without these contracted chambers; those, however, in the English service, which are now constructed, and which are loaded at the muzzle all have them. In the ancient guns the chambers were moveable, and were taken out of the gun, and the charge placed in them, and were then replaced and fixed in their proper position by a bolt of iron, or some such clumsy contrivance. This will explain how it was that guns had three or five chambers. These moveable chambers were the means of putting the charges into the gun.

* "Elementary Lectures on Artillery," by Captain (now Colonel) Owen, and Captain Dames, R.A. This little work contains much useful information.

with whirlwinds and thunders. Something similar is told in real history about the campaign of Alexander the Great in India, to the effect that the Hindoos had the means of discharging flames and missiles on their enemies from a distance. There seems to be no doubt that gunpowder was in use in India at the much later date of 1200 A.D.; and the knowledge of it may possibly enough have travelled westward by means of the Saracens, through whom it reached Europe chiefly by way of Spain.

Yet gunpowder had its European inventors, independently of its Asiatic origin. Friar Bacon, there can be little doubt, was the first of these, at least in a certain sense; but his idea seems to have been merely to use it for fireworks, and at any rate not for war. This was in the thirteenth century. A letter exists by a Spanish Friar, Brother Ferrarius, a contemporary of Roger Bacon, in which he gives the ingredients of the Greek fire; which ingredients are the same as those of gunpowder, only differing in proportion. Possibly this may have suggested the thing to Friar Bacon.

Barthold Schwartz, a German monk, who lived about 1320, is commonly supposed to have had a considerable share in the invention. The story runs that he was mixing the ingredients in a mortar and that he placed a stone on them; but that they accidentally took fire and projected the stone to some distance. He is also credited with the discovery of the method of *granulating* powder (not, of course, in the perfect way in which it is done at Waltham), and it is said that immediately after this discovery cannon of small size appeared in the armoury of almost every European state.

The Greek fire is said to have been known to the Emperors of Byzantium even in the seventh century, and the composition kept as a State secret: some 500 or 600 years later the Arabs knew it: and it appears to have been used by the Saracens against the Christians in the crusades, and to have caused great consternation. It differed from gunpowder in being of a viscous nature, and sticking to the object against which it was thrown. The two substances are so dissimilar in properties and operation, that one is surprised to find their composition so much alike. Brother Ferrarius gives the ingredients of the Greek fire and their proportions as follows:—20lb. of saltpetre, 8lb. sulphur vivum, 5lb. willow charcoal.* It seems to have been

* A crusader who accompanied Richard I. says of it, that, "with a pernicious stench and livid flame, it consumes even flint and iron, nor could it be extinguished by water; but by sprinkling sand upon it the violence of it may be abated, and vinegar poured upon it will put it out."

projected in barrels by means of the military machines then in use.

Gunpowder having become known in Europe, probably through the Saracens and Moors, the discovery was rapidly spread by the mercenary soldiers who abounded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and who served first one State and then another. These adventurers, we may be sure, carried with them the new invention of fire-arms. Slowly, indeed, did artillery make its way. Those were ages when certain arts flourished magnificently, that of architecture for instance, which attained at that time a perfection of glory and of beauty, which has never quite been equalled before or since. But metallurgy and the merely mechanical arts were not so well known, and consequently gunnery could not attain a great or rapid development. The progress was gradual but sure, and the result was a complete change in the conditions of warfare. Ancient modes of fighting differed according to age and country, but they all were widely different from the tactics of modern war, and this last-named fact is owing to the use of gunpowder.

Thus, in the Homeric age we have the combats of individual champions, men of gigantic strength, such as Ajax or Hector, who could hurl a stone so huge that two men of Homer's own age could scarcely lift it

So, again, in Holy Scripture we see something of the conditions of warfare, when acted upon mainly by personal strength and prowess,—witness the exploits of Samson and David; in the case of the latter of these too there was something particularly characteristic of ancient as opposed to modern war; for when the smooth stone from the brook, slung by his strong and skilful arm, had slain his huge antagonist, the Philistines seeing their champion was dead, never thought of standing their ground for a moment, but simply fled, while the Israelites pursued them and gained an easy victory, so that it was well sung on the day of their triumphant return that Saul had slain his thousands and David his ten thousands.

We find the earliest mention of the bow in Holy Scripture, where it is said, in the Book of Genesis, that Ismael became an archer; and we find the earliest record of the use of military engines in the Second Book of Paralipomerion (ch. xxvi. v. 15) where it is said that King Ozias made engines of diverse kinds in Jerusalem to shoot arrows and great stones.

Such engines were employed in subsequent ages and in various countries, and were known as the catapulta, ballista, battering ram, &c.

In the more advanced nations of antiquity, a high standard of military discipline prevailed; the combats of individual

heroes disappeared, and well-ordered masses of troops under regular officers, with a duly regulated proportion of cavalry and infantry (as in the Roman legion), were the fighting power: chariots were extensively used in some places (in Ancient Britain for instance), but they belong rather to the infancy of warfare.

In the Middle Ages personal championship again played a prominent part; and we have stories such as that of Richard Cœur de Lion riding along the whole Saracen line without finding an enemy to stand against him, and that of Robert Bruce crushing with one blow the helmet and head of Sir Henry Bohun in sight of the English and Scotch armies. Indeed, the prowess of William the Conquerer at Hastings is another instance in point.

There were not always such champions as these. And, moreover, there became developed, especially in England, an arm of great power in the shape of archery, which seems to have been principally introduced into this country by the Normans, and to have attained its zenith in the fourteenth century. Strong as the cavalry of that day were in their armour, they were frequently held in check by the archers, whose arrows killed and wounded their horses, even when they could not penetrate the iron plates which protected the riders. Yet, on the other hand, the horses were partially protected by armour; and also it happened sometimes that the knights themselves fought on foot, and only mounted their horses to pursue a beaten enemy. So that great as was the power of the archers, and above all of the English archers, these knights and other cavalry must have been most formidable to infantry, at least when the nature of the ground permitted them to act. We shall see how, in this latter point, circumstances have changed. Such, however, was the state of things when gunpowder appeared on the scene, and that not merely in siege operations, but on the open battlefield.

We may imagine how great was the consternation of those who had to face gunpowder for the first time: nor can we be surprised if some of the ancient knights on witnessing its effects, exclaimed, "It is the grave of the valiant." And by this they probably meant not so much the courageous as the physically powerful men whose strength and weight could bear down resistance. To such heroes a cannon-shot, even from a clumsy gun loaded with feeble powder, coming as it might do from a distance such as no archer had ever compassed with the strongest bow, might prove to be indeed their "grave." Had it not been for the ignorance in that age of the mechanical arts gunpowder would have at once become much

more formidable. As things were, it took more than 200 years to assert its supremacy. Possibly after the first scare was over it lost some of its terrors, and produced less moral effect. Battles continued to be fought mainly in the old way. At Poitiers, where a king was taken prisoner, either artillery was not used at all, or else it played a very subordinate part. The battle of Agincourt (fought on the 25th October, 1415), though cannons were used on both sides, was won by the English archers.

For siege operations, guns came more and more into use. Richard II. is said to have had 400 when he attacked the Castle of St. Malo. At the siege of Orleans (1428 and 1429), the scene of Joan of Arc's great triumph, an important use was made of artillery; and the Earl of Salisbury, the English commander, was killed by a cannon shot. In another part of the world some years later, in 1453, the Turks, under the Sultan Mahomet II. at the siege of Constantinople, taught Europe the lesson, which she has since well learnt, what cannon could do in breaching solid masonry.

In England, again, it does not appear that artillery did very much during the Wars of the Roses, which began in the reign of Henry VI. and ended on Bosworth Field (22nd August, 1485). The battle of St. Albans, for instance, in 1455, seems to have been won entirely by archers.

But Henry VII. and Henry VIII. took pains to introduce the art of gunnery into England, and brought over Flemish gunners for this purpose.*

For naval purposes, again, artillery naturally came into use more readily and rapidly than was the case on land.†

England seems to have been behind the Continent in the development of artillery. Charles VIII. of France had it so well organised in his service that he caused considerable consternation among the Italians when he invaded their country.

Also Queen Isabella of Spain, towards the end of the fifteenth century, had one of the finest trains of artillery in Europe. Spain was all along, during that period, ahead of other nations.

The celebrated action fought on Flodden Field, 9th September, 1513, nearly 170 years after Crécy, was mainly done in the old style. Truly, as Sir Walter Scott says—

* A vessel called the *Mary Rose* was sunk at Spithead, in the time of Henry VIII., and a gun has been recovered from the wreck, similar in construction to modern ordnance, such as it was before the recent improvements.

† Bronze ordnance was first cast in this country in 1521, during the reign of Henry VIII.; iron being cast afterwards in that of Edward VI. in 1547.

And distant salutation passed
From the loud cannon's mouth ;
Not in the close successive rattle
That breathes the voice of modern battle,
But slow and far between.

Gunpowder was there, but in a subordinate place. The bow and arrow were there also. The combat was carried on in the old hacking and hewing style, till night fell on the contending hosts and rendered it too dark for them to hew and hack any longer.

Later on in the sixteenth century gunpowder had become far more important in war. At the battle of Remi, in 1554, light field guns, having limbers, are said to have been used, and to have accompanied the cavalry. In the reign of Elizabeth artillery had attained a considerable development, and guns of various sizes and calibres were constructed. Meanwhile, a man, far in advance of his age, and gifted with great talent and ingenuity, Tartaglia, had investigated gunnery scientifically ; he explained (though not quite correctly) the motion of a projectile, taking into account the resistance of the air, and also the theory of gunpowder ; moreover, he invented the gunner's quadrant, an instrument still in use. His work was dedicated to Henry VIII. It is worthy of remark that the great artist Leonardo da Vinci, who was born in 1452, wrote a mathematical treatise on gunnery long before any one else in Europe had given any attention to the theory of projectiles ; he was, in fact, much more than Tartaglia in advance of his age. In the seventeenth century the thirty years' war took place ; and towards the close of that war there broke out in England the great contest between Charles I. and the Parliament, in which Oliver Cromwell, a little later on, played so conspicuous a part. The hero of the thirty years' war was Gustavus Adolphus. He is called by Captain Hime the father of modern field artillery. He certainly made an immense step in a very important direction, that, namely, of sacrificing precision in firing to lightness and mobility ; so he had his field guns made of leather and coiled rope over a cylinder of copper ; he also adopted cartridges with shot attached to them, thereby increasing the rapidity of firing. He died bravely on the field of Lützen (6th November, 1632). Few kings in modern warfare have died in action, and he was the first royal victim to gunpowder, falling actually on the field ; he was killed by a musket ball.

Artillery was abundantly used in England during the civil war ; and the art of gunnery made altogether great progress during the seventeenth century. Among other things the " Dialogues on Motion," by Galileo, were published in 1646, in

which the theory of projectiles was fully and scientifically treated.

In the eighteenth century the principal progress in artillery was due to Frederick the Great, who, among other things, invented what is now termed horse artillery.

But the greatest development of it that had ever up to that time taken place was under Napoleon; he had himself begun life as an officer of artillery, and was therefore well acquainted with it both in theory and practice. He made very effectual use of it at Friedland, at Wagram, at Lutzen, and at Hanau, on which last occasion the artillery of the Guard, under their most able commander, General Drouet, saved the French army (then retreating after Leipsic) from the allied forces under Marshal Wrede, who was endeavouring to intercept their retreat (30th October, 1813).

This brings us to the nineteenth century, and therefore to modern times; but it is necessary now to turn back, in order not to omit a most important branch of the subject. I have hitherto been dwelling chiefly on the invention and progress of artillery in the proper sense of the word: it remains to explain briefly the steps by which gunpowder came into use in what are now termed *small arms*, that is, weapons such as muskets or rifles, which are carried by the individual soldier.

In the early part of the ages of chivalry the infantry were apparently a subordinate arm, and unable, generally speaking, to hold their own against cavalry. This state of things was modified by the perfection to which the art of archery attained; and we shall now see that it has been completely reversed, and that infantry with modern arms of precision in their hands are more than a match for cavalry; and indeed, that the deadly fire from the breech-loading rifles which they carry (even when compared with the fire of artillery) causes most of the destruction that is done on the battle-field.

It is stated that a weapon called the *Arquebuse à mèche* was used in Germany in 1378; hand guns were employed at the siege of Arras in 1414, and at the siege of Lucca in 1430. Then a weapon called the arquebus was introduced about the year 1476; later on some improvement was made in it, and it got the name of the *haquebut*. There had also been in use another kind of hand gun, something between artillery and small arms, carried by two men, and placed on a stand to be fired. The arquebus was originally fired by applying a match to the touch-hole; later on, locks (though somewhat clumsy in make) were invented.

Pistols (so called from having been made at Pistoja) were

introduced in the sixteenth century.* English cavalry had them in 1544.

When we consider what awkward weapons the fire-arms of those days were, and how long it took to load them, the wonderful thing is that they supplanted bows and arrows, even so soon as was actually the case; so rapid was the shooting with the latter, and so true was the aim of the good archer. Only, the arrow was doubtless less efficient in penetrating armour. In 1580, Michael Montaigne, a very remarkable man, wrote as follows about small arms:—"Except the noise in our ears to which we will henceforth be accustomed, I think that it is an arm of very little effect, and I hope that we shall one day give up its use."

The fire-arms carried by infantry came eventually to be all called *muskets*, and took the shape so well known in modern times; but they were at first heavier, often longer, and more clumsy, than anything the present century has seen.

About the year 1671 there was invented the formidable weapon called the bayonet, made at first with a handle to fit into the barrel of a musket, afterwards with a socket, so as to fit on the outside of the barrel and not impede the fire from it. It is named from Bayonne, its birth-place, and it was naturally adopted in France before finding its way into England. The advantage of it to infantry was enormous; it enabled them to discard the pike, for which the musket, with the bayonet fixed, was more than an efficient substitute. The infantry found their relative strength greatly increased. If formed in square, with the front rank kneeling, they were an impenetrable barrier against cavalry, and could fire on them deliberately as they advanced to the charge. It is well known how successfully the squares of British infantry resisted the best cavalry of France, protected though they were by cuirasses, at Waterloo. And at the present time, owing to the adoption of the breech-loading rifle, the relative power of infantry, as regards cavalry and even artillery, is greater than ever. The battalion square need no longer be formed for the purpose of resistance, for a smaller body of infantry, back to back, with the breech-loader in hand, could well hold their own; and, in fact, no cavalry officer would venture to attack infantry *in full formation*, unless, indeed, he well knew their ammunition to be expended.

During the thirty-eight years which elapsed between the

* There is in the Museum of the United Service Institution in London a kind of pistol very like a modern revolver, only much more clumsy, of the date of Charles I. It seems an illustration of the saying that there is nothing new under the sun.

battle of Waterloo and the Crimean war, things were not entirely at a standstill; some minor improvements were introduced: copper percussion caps supplanted the old flint and steel lock in small arms, and greater attention began to be given to the art of gunnery. But it was not a period favourable to the development of warlike inventions, being on the whole a time of profound peace; there were, no doubt, wars here and there, and hard fought battles in India; but there was no contest on a large scale in Europe between the Great Powers.

Since the period, however, when Louis Napoleon became Emperor of the French, followed as it shortly was by the Crimean War, and later on by other wars arising from various causes—a period which, counting to the present time, embraces more than a quarter of a century—military inventions and improvements of various kinds have succeeded one another with unexampled rapidity. Of these the principal are as follows: first, the system of breech-loading fire-arms; second, the general introduction of rifling, both in great guns and small arms, including pistols, accompanied by the use of elongated instead of spherical projectiles; third, the construction of monster guns.

As regards the first, it was far from being really a novel idea. Fire-arms were originally loaded, though in a very clumsy way, at the breech and not at the muzzle; yet so completely had this method of loading disappeared, that when it was revived (of course in an infinitely superior form to that adopted in the fourteenth century) rather more than twenty years ago, it was hailed as a new invention. The introduction of it into our own service is very much connected with the name of Sir William Armstrong, whose guns (constructed on the breech-loading plan) were adopted by the War Office, and at one time considered to be the great weapon of the future; but opinions have changed, and we have since reverted in great measure to the muzzle-loading system; yet it is probable there will be again a change, and that the tide will once more set in favour of the breech-loaders, at least so far as the more moderate-sized guns are concerned. Sir William Armstrong is said to be engaged in some important improvements which are likely to facilitate this. As regards foreign nations, the Krupp guns, used chiefly (if not almost entirely) in the Prussian service, are pre-eminent. There is one of these, intended for use in the field, in the museum of artillery in the Rotunda at Woolwich, and it certainly, for lightness and for beauty of construction, surpasses anything with which I am acquainted. It must, however, be explained that there is a great distinction to be made, as regards breech-loading, between artillery and

small arms used by infantry. There are certain undoubted advantages in the system, which apply to both one and the other, but in the former case there are drawbacks which do not exist in the latter; and specially is it to be remarked that in one point, the rapidity of loading, there is no great difference as far as great guns are concerned;* whereas, on the other hand, the speed with which the rifles used by infantry can be loaded at the breech (as compared with the muzzle-loading plan) is so very great as to confer an immeasurable advantage on the troops so armed.

With regard to the second point, the general introduction of rifling, it is a purely modern improvement to apply it to ordnance; and the names of Armstrong and Whitworth will occur to all artillerists as having been prominent in bringing it into notice in England. As applied to small arms it has been long in use, but until recently rifles have been put into the hands of certain picked regiments only, whereas now all our troops have them. There are several systems of rifling; but all are founded on the one plan of making grooves in the barrel of the weapon, so that the projectile, fitting into these grooves as it is fired off, acquires a rotatory motion about the axis of the barrel, and as it retains this motion after its expulsion from the mouth of the piece, it has, in fact, a rotation round an axis coincident with its line of flight. This conduces greatly to accuracy. But a very great step has been made of late years by the introduction of *elongated* projectiles for rifles instead of spherical ones. They used to be called conical projectiles, but they were not really of the shape of a cone (or only partially so), and the name is not now so much employed. The advantage is enormous, for not only do the elongated projectiles keep their rotation round the original axis even better than spherical rifle-balls, but they experience much less resistance from the air, and, therefore, the range is immensely increased; to this, in fact, is due the vast increase in range which modern fire-arms have obtained.

The introduction of guns of an unprecedented size and weight is the third of the recent developments which I have mentioned. Not only have we larger guns for field service, such as the sixteen pounders now in use, but huge monsters

* That is in our own service, for I am not so sure about the Krupp guns, which I think could be loaded very rapidly indeed. Since the above was written some important experiments have been made at Meppen under the superintendence of Herr Krupp himself with some of the heavier guns of his construction, which tend to show a very great superiority: 1st, in the lightness of the gun itself; 2nd, in the high *muzzle* velocity obtained (above 1900 feet in one instance); 3rd, in the accuracy of fire. These guns are all made of steel, and they are all breech-loaders.

have been constructed of thirty-eight and thirty-five tons weight, throwing projectiles of proportionate size ; indeed, we have larger guns than these ; an eighty-ton gun has been built and experiments made with it, and four guns of 100 tons are now constructed. The use of armour-plating for ships has been the great motive power in developing these huge guns ; the artillerist will not allow himself to be beaten by the inventors of armour-plates ; and the thicker the coating by which vessels are protected, the larger is the gun which is brought to bear upon it. Some of the experiments tend to show that the Palliser shot or shell can be driven through any armour which a vessel can carry. But these monster guns are, of course, unwieldy, and require machinery to work them with ease and rapidity.*

Another development in the employment of engines of destruction is the general use of *shells*, instead of solid shot such as were used principally sixty or seventy years ago. Shells are no new thing ; they were indeed known in the Middle Ages not very long after gunpowder itself ; being, however, of course, of somewhat clumsy construction. But the present tendency is to use them as much as possible in the place of large solid shot.

An attempt was made some years ago to introduce the use of shells for small arms, but it was truly said, that they tended not so much to disable as to torture the man struck by them, and the present Emperor of Russia (much to his credit) took a leading part in procuring that they should be discarded from European warfare. But for the purpose of being fired from cannon, shells are in use more than ever. Most people know what they are ; hollow shot in fact, with a charge of gunpowder inside intended to burst the shell at a given time, and thus cause a greater destructive power than solid shot can have. They are of different kinds ; some have bullets inside them with a charge of powder in the rear, and on bursting they scatter the bullets ; these are called (from their inventor) Shrapnel shells, and are used against masses of troops in the field. Others are used against forts and ships. Those intended to pierce ironclad vessels are called Palliser shells, thus bearing the name of one of the best and most successful of modern inventors, Sir William Palliser ; they are more nearly approach-

* I myself saw two years ago some experiments with the eighty-ton gun at Shoeburyness ; the gun was on a carriage placed on a tramway, and was worked by hand. I think it took an hour after it had been fired for the gunners to bring it into position for firing again ; so great was the recoil, and so difficult was the gun to move.

ing to the conical shape than any other projectile, and have points of chilled iron; they have enormous penetrating power, and have performed wonderful feats in this way. They can be used either as shot or shell; in the latter case they are, of course, charged with powder inside, and it is curious that they require no special means to make them explode, for the violence of the shock, on impact, together with the heat generated, is sufficient to ignite the powder within and to explode the shell. Other shells are burst by means of what is called a fuze: these latter contrivances are of two kinds,* percussion fuzes and time fuzes. The former are made of gun-metal, and are screwed into the front part of the shell; they have a detonating apparatus within, and when the shell strikes the object, the detonating composition explodes, and the flash is communicated to the powder in the shell.

Time fuzes are made of beech-wood, and act by means of an ingenious arrangement, which it would take too much space to describe in detail, but which depends on the steady and gradual burning of what is called fuze-composition, a substance similar in its ingredients to gunpowder, but having them mixed in different proportions, and which can be made to burn at the rate of about one inch of fuze composition in five seconds, or if so required, still more slowly in seven and a half seconds, by the addition of some more saltpetre.

The description of the terrible engines of war called torpedoes must be omitted in the present Paper, for it would take up too much space if given at length: torpedoes, however, fully deserve attention, for they will evidently form a most important element in the naval warfare of the future.

I may mention, among the recent improvements in scientific gunnery, the methods for ascertaining the distance of the objects at which the fire is directed, or range-finding. This may be done roughly, and, of course, must often be done on actual service, by the judgment of a practised eye; it may be done more perfectly by firing trial shots and seeing where they fall: but the high standard of accuracy now required demands something more perfect still. Any one acquainted with elementary trigonometry (as officers of artillery are always presumed to be) and provided with instruments, such as a sextant or prismatic compass and with ordinary trigonometrical tables, can very easily calculate a range; the object, however, is to enable men of less education, such as an average non-commissioned officer, to make the calculation without the help of mathematics. Two modern instruments have been introduced for this purpose, and

* There is a third called an electric fuze, used for torpedoes, blasting, &c.

both give good and accurate results—the Nolan and the Watkin range-finders. The first was invented by Major Nolan, and is on the principle of the well-known surveying instrument called the theodolite, but it enables the observer to read off the range without using any tables or making any calculations on paper. The Nolan range-finder is, however, a somewhat heavy and cumbrous instrument, and has to be laid on a gun while the observations are being taken. It is now, in great measure, supplanted by the second instrument mentioned, invented by Captain Watkin: this is much lighter and is easily and conveniently held in the hand, and, indeed, a still lighter and smaller variety of it is used by infantry for musketry ranges. It is on the principle of the sextant (though it differs from it greatly in detail), and like the first it reads off the range for you without your having to calculate it. The principle of the sextant and all kindred instruments is this. If two plane mirrors are inclined to each other at any angle, it is a rule in optics that, supposing a pencil of light reflected first from one mirror and then from the other to the eye of an observer, the angle between the first direction of the pencil as it passes from the object to mirror No. 1 and its final direction as it passes from mirror No. 2 to the observer's eye, is just twice the angle of inclination of the two mirrors to each other. The Watkin range-finder enables you to construct a right-angled triangle very easily, for the mirrors being adjusted at an angle of 45° you at once measure a right angle, and another adjustment enables you to measure another angle; your base is already measured; and finally you read off the range on the instrument.

The rapid development of all these inventions is most remarkable, if we remember that in the Crimean war (about twenty-five years ago) there were no rifled cannon employed, excepting a very few guns rifled on the Lancaster principle. Rifled muskets were, however, used. There were no breech-loaders. The Russian position at the Alma would probably never have been carried, if its defenders had been armed with breech-loading rifles.

In the Italian war of 1859 the French had rifled cannon in the field, the Austrians had not. Rifles were in the hands of the infantry on both sides.

In the American Civil War armoured men-of-war and monitors were employed; so were also torpedoes.

In 1866 took place the war between Austria and Prussia, and there both armies had rifled cannon and rifled small arms; the Prussians alone had breech-loaders for their infantry (though of a comparatively low power and short range); and to this their great success must partly, though by no means wholly, be attributed.

When the Franco-German war broke out in 1870 the use of the above-named weapons had become general ; and both parties were armed with them. Captain Needham, R.M.A., in an interesting lecture delivered last year at the United Service Institution, says that war was "the first campaign in which far-reaching, hard-hitting, and rapid-firing arms of precision were used." Indeed, it now became evident what a formidable instrument for the purposes of defence the breech-loading rifle is, when handled by infantry well-drilled and resolute. The battle of Sedan was principally won by the Prussian artillery. But on the whole it seems probable that the rifles of the infantry are generally the chief agent of destruction on modern battle-fields.

The formidable character of fire-arms, as now in use, has greatly modified the military tactics which were practised at the beginning of the century. The advance of large masses in column, which Napoleon I. adopted so frequently and so successfully, has been necessarily abandoned, for it would expose the troops to certain destruction ; and a new system of attack has been elaborated, according to which the men will advance in more open formation, as skirmishers do, and will avail themselves of all cover that they can fairly get to shelter them. This latter is a lesson the men readily learn. The difficulty is to induce them to leave the cover at the right time (even under a severe fire from the enemy) and continue the advance.* Fire-discipline (as it is termed) is about the last thing that even good soldiers learn.

The Journal of the United Service Institution, which stands at the head of this article, is a work highly interesting in a military point of view, containing as it does lectures delivered by officers of all branches of the service, Army and Navy, in the Theatre of the Institution, as well as some discussions which from time to time take place after the lectures ; it also contains the Annual Prize Essay for which a gold medal is always given. As these lectures and essays are often written by officers of very high ability, they are a sort of record of the modern inventions and their developments, and also of the changes thereby introduced into military tactics ; moreover, they frequently contain valuable contributions to military history.

The Prize Essays to which the Royal United Service Institu-

* This was lately noticed by an officer who wrote from the seat of war in Afghanistan ; he spoke to some men who were thus taking shelter overmuch, but he found it no easy thing to get them to move forward. The men are not always under the eye of their officers, and they no longer advance with their comrades close by them, shoulder to shoulder, to encourage them to go on, or to mock at them if they play the coward. This will be a difficulty to be overcome as best it may in the new tactics.

tion has this year awarded its gold medal (for, owing to a technical reason, instead of there being one only, there are two medallists) are written by Captain Clayton, R.A., and Major Fraser, R.E.; they are on the subject of "Field Intrenching: its Application on the Battle-field and its Bearing on Tactics."

It would be out of place in these pages to examine these able Essays in detail, but they will doubtless be read with attention by students of the art of war, and will repay well their careful perusal. They both deal, as may be gathered from their title, with the all-important subject of field-fortifications, whether such as are hastily thrown up on the eve of an engagement or even (in the case of a long battle) as the engagement progresses; or those works of a more permanent character, which an army acting on the defensive will naturally construct if time permits, and which in some cases form an intrenched camp. The fearful havoc caused by modern fire-arms renders it necessary to protect troops as much as possible; and no good general would attempt to defend a position against assailants without making use of intrenchments as far as circumstances required and time allowed: and, indeed, even the attacking troops, if they wish to succeed, must often do the same thing, when the natural features of the ground are such as not to afford them cover.

Captain Clayton's Essay is in great part historical, and gives many important particulars with regard to recent wars. He goes on to say that "our analysis of modern experience will show us when attacks are not likely to succeed;" that is—

When made by raw troops; when the assailant's artillery is not good enough, or not well enough handled, to overpower that of the defenders; and when the infantry, from want of training, cannot trust itself to open order fighting, but must move in masses.

Again—

When the attack, though made by troops of superior quality to the defenders, is carried out in an unsuitable manner, as in closed bodies. And also, when made, even with superior troops, on correct principles, and in superior numbers, if the defenders have a clear field of fire, and are well covered, and the assailants cannot bring up an overwhelming artillery mass to concentrate its fire on some well-defined decisive points. But he further says we cannot admit that an intrenched position is now absolutely unassailable—

as it seems some superficial observers had supposed. He concludes that an "advantage is gained by the power given by intrenchments to a small resolute force of holding its ground for a time against superior numbers."

But (he adds) it is to be feared we cannot trust to intrenchments to atone for inferiority of quality, or of numbers if the quality of the

two armies is equal, unless under the conduct of a general of exceptional ability, or under local circumstances, which will not be of frequent occurrence.

He thinks, however, such local circumstances might be found if England were ever invaded, and time were afforded to throw up strong works in suitable localities.

Major Fraser's Essay is headed by a quotation from Napoleon, "Il faut changer de tactique tous les dix ans." He mentions that field-fortification was used even before the introduction of fire-arms, but rather to ward off *shock* or to give the defender a vantage, than to protect from missiles. He goes briefly, yet carefully, through the improvements that have been made from time to time in the use both of artillery and musketry, and suggests further changes: while he devotes a great portion of his interesting essay, as might naturally be expected from an engineer officer, to the details of field intrenchments, showing when, where, and how to intrench, and the advantages to be gained both by defenders and assailants in the employment of such works. He also touches on what may, under some circumstances, be of great moment in war, the making *night attacks*. Instead of the victorious general as at Flodden drawing off his troops as night comes on, we shall in future probably find the night specially chosen for certain operations. As Major Fraser tells us, the difficulty of attacking intrenchments with their present power of resistance will incline assailants to risk a night attack, or an attack in fog, rather than incur certain loss, as they must do, by an attack in front during daylight. "At such times," he says, "the shooting qualities (apart from rapidity) of the new arms disappear, and the defence is deprived of an element on which it counted." Kars was captured at night, in the late war, by the Russians.

In conclusion, Major Fraser says, that "Intrenching is only one of many important elements in war." Yet his essay, from its whole tone, lays the greatest stress upon the value of intrenchments. Then he tells us that "To strike and to parry have always been the alternatives in war. For the first is required fitness in arms; for the second, aptness in intrenching." Moreover, he alludes to the "need for *Fire Discipline* and of a thorough knowledge of what the arms can do," and he finally admonishes us that "success depends on quickness."

We have seen, then, that at the date of the battle of Waterloo, infantry, if they stood firm, were safe as against cavalry, even with the old musket and bayonet. At present they are so safe that, provided they are in full formation, it would be madness in the cavalry to go near them. We see, further, that it is difficult and hazardous for infantry armed with equally good weapons to

attack an enemy's infantry when defending a good and well-chosen position.

At Gravelotte (18th August, 1870) the left flank of the French army was supported by the works of Metz and the valley of the Moselle; the right wing of their position, near St. Privat, rested on no natural obstacles and very few intrenchments were thrown up; but the village of St. Privat looked down an open glaxis-like slope, and moreover it was a strongly-built village with gardens enclosed by stone walls. Against this position, the Prussian Guards, the flower of their troops, were sent (it is said, through the impatience of Prince August of Wurtemberg), and this was done before a sufficient preparation had been made by the fire of artillery. The French army in this battle behaved in a manner worthy of their old renown, and were not very far from winning the day: they poured forth a murderous fire from the houses and walls of St. Privat, and the result is shown by the graves where lie 6000 Prussian Guardsmen, who met their death in that unsuccessful attack. Then afterwards the Saxons entered the fight, driving back the extreme right of the French army; and then a heavy fire of artillery was also brought to bear against the village, the walls and houses of which began to fall; while the German infantry, under the protection of their guns, renewed the attack, and carried the position. On the next morning, Marshal Bazaine withdrew his army within the protection of the forts of Metz. Captain Clayton gives a full account of this celebrated action; which not only had an important influence on the war then in progress, but also showed the necessity for modifying the previous system of tactics, and for avoiding (as a general rule) the attempt to attack in closed bodies: this lesson the Russians, who had not hitherto profited as they might by the experience of others, learned to their cost at Plevna.

It has been computed that at Gravelotte over 90 per cent. of the total Prussian loss was caused by rifle-bullets, and less than 5 per cent. by artillery fire. And this opens up a curious question: Whether, even now, with all our improvements, the effect of artillery fire is not due to the *moral* rather than the *material* damage occasioned by it. It is so most certainly in many cases. Captain Trotter, R.E., stated at the United Service Institution that he had made an estimate that at Kars (in the late war) the Russians fired 150 shells for every casualty that occurred. Indeed, the Russian artillery during a great part of the war was very inefficient. Yet at the battle of Alaja Tagh, which took place towards the end of the campaign in Asia Minor, the Russians are said to have brought up their guns to within 1500 yards of the Turks, and to have done

terrible execution with them. It is probable that fresh artillery, under better and more competent officers, had arrived. On the whole, however, the late contest between Russia and Turkey was fought not so much by the guns of the artillery as by the rifles of the infantry. Captain Needham tells us that "in the late war we have, for the first time, long-range fire constantly and systematically employed." He states that the Turkish infantry had weapons having a range of about 3000 paces (about one and a half miles); and that they could load and fire them fifteen times in a minute. Thus armed, they could sometimes cause fearful havoc among the Russians by firing (at a great elevation) on the spot where they knew their enemy was—even at a distance where they could not take accurate aim. The Russians appear to have had somewhat inferior rifles, sighted only up to 600 yards. General Todleben (quoted by Captain Clayton) speaks of the "scathing and ravaging fire of the Turkish infantry," at Plevna, "which had never been produced before by any European army." All this opens up another formidable question—viz., how far artillery can face infantry in the field when provided with such weapons? No doubt the Shrapnel-shell of the former is fairly effective at a distance of 3200 yards (which is scarcely within range of infantry fire); but if artillery is to do any great execution, it must frequently come nearer, and within reach of rifle-shot. A distinguished officer, Colonel Brackenbury, R.A., has recently suggested the use of portable iron mantlets to protect the gunners. Whether this will be adopted I know not. But as it is said to be a maxim in law that there is never a wrong without a remedy, so in military matters it may be said that there is never a difficulty or a danger without a resource to meet it.

And now one cannot help asking whether gunpowder, with all its implements of destruction, has been a benefit or a curse to mankind? At first sight, the humane man might rush to the conclusion that it has been an unmitigated evil. And yet such is not the fact; so far from battles having become more bloody since the introduction of gunpowder, they have, on the whole, been less so. Captain Hime, in one place of his *Essays*, speaks with apparent disapproval of the action of the Mediæval Church in discouraging engines of war. But this had nothing to do with gunpowder, which was then unknown in Europe. The Church, though she fully recognises the lawfulness and necessity of just wars—even providing in her Pontifical forms for the blessing of a sword and a military standard—has not unfrequently endeavoured to mitigate the horrors which war inevitably causes; and, as the ambassadress of the God of mercy and peace, how could she do otherwise? Yet if, when

gunpowder made its first appearance on European battle-fields, she could have seen a prophetic vision of the far distant results, she might almost have welcomed its advent, and greeted it with her benediction. It appears, indeed, by statistics, that (with some exceptions) the more formidable the weapons used the less has been the slaughter, and that this holds good progressively up to the present time. One of the most bloody battles in history (to give an instance) was that of Fontenoy (25th June, 1741), when the Emperor Lothair was defeated by Charles le Chauve and Louis le Germanique. The loss was most severe on both sides, and it was said that 100,000 men were killed, and the nobility of Champagne almost extinguished. To take, on the other hand, one instance from modern times: Waterloo was a very hard fought battle; there were present 296 British artillery officers (strictly British and not counting Germans; Dutch, or Belgians), and out of these only six (some say five) were killed. Certainly, there were thirty-three wounded, but even so the proportion is small. The cavalry suffered more, and the infantry more still, which latter is generally the case. And it is clearly to be understood that the comparative lightness of the losses sustained in modern war is calculated by taking a percentage of the whole forces engaged; and no one denies that troops fighting on a particular part of the field may suffer most fearfully, and far out of proportion to the rest. The losses of the Prussian Guards at Gravelotte form a striking instance of this; and so again those of certain regiments at Quatre-Bras and Waterloo. But there is no doubt that, taking into account all the forces on the battle-field, a smaller number are killed now than formerly was the case before gunpowder was invented, and a still smaller number now than in the wars at the beginning of this century.

Yet some curious exceptions to the general rule occurred in the Middle Ages, before the *general* adoption of gunpowder, but after its first introduction into Europe. At Zagonara (1423) only three men were killed, and these by suffocation in the mud into which they had fallen. At Molinella (1467) no one was killed. In an action between the Papal and Neapolitan troops in 1486, no one was killed, and no one was recorded to be even wounded. But these were probably owing to the mercenaries then extensively employed; they wished no man's death, but what they liked above all to have in their power, was a rich prisoner, from whom a heavy ransom could be extracted.

On the whole, then, the more terrible the weapon the less is the bloodshed. And the reason is probably this. In a *mêlée* men are excited, and in the heat of their blood they will fight till they are hewn down by main force. But when they have

to face a storm of projectiles fired from a distance, and see their comrades killed by their side or disabled, without being able to help them, then it is that the instinct of self-preservation comes into play, and even brave men will not expose themselves to utter destruction. Thus, it comes to pass that the beaten party recognise the fact of their defeat, and the carnage abates or ceases. Consequently, gunpowder with all its destructive weapons causes a smaller per-centage of deaths in the contending armies. It has also done something towards abolishing irregular warfare; the stronghold of the petty tyrant or robber chieftain, defensible against infantry, became powerless against artillery. In fact, the strength of this latter in sieges is, of course, relatively far greater than on the open field; and many a fortress, deemed almost impregnable in days gone by, would now fall like a house of cards before a modern siege train.

And this leads me to touch, in conclusion, on a branch of the subject which I have not dwelt upon, as I have been discussing the change of tactics in the field, but which deserves ample consideration, and that is, the great change caused by gunpowder in *permanent fortification*. To treat this as it deserves would require a separate article, and that, moreover, would be of so technical a character as to be adapted for few but professional soldiers. It suffices to say here that although certain main conditions had to be fulfilled by ancient as by modern forts, and they both had some features in common, yet the difference in other respects is immense. The old forts owed their strength to the height of their walls, and in some cases to their inaccessible position; but the introduction of cannon created a revolution in the art of defence, as in other things, for the walls could then be breached by artillery from a distance. Thus, it became necessary to screen them partly by sinking them below the ground, and partly by raising a glacis in front of the ditch. The ancient masonry wall, the top of which was used as a terreplein of defence, has been replaced by the broad earthen rampart of the present time, and the parapet wall, on the top of the main wall, generally speaking, by an earthen parapet. For this, however, masonry is still sometimes used; and in special cases, where great strength is needed, and where it is necessary to protect the guns of the fort by every possible means, the parapets have iron plates. But the admirer of the picturesque and the lover of art must always regret that modern fortifications, with their unsightly masses of earth and walls of brickwork, have supplanted the grand old castles of feudal times, few of which are now in existence, since they have been subjected to two destructive agencies—the explosive force of gunpowder and the levelling hand of time.

ART. VII.—LORD LAWRENCE.

A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-1858. By JOHN WILLIAM KAYE, F.R.S., &c. London: Allen & Co., 1877.*

ANOTHER truly great man has lately been added to the company of departed heroes, who sleep in the sacred soil of Westminster's famous Abbey. For though hardly a great Viceroy, John Laird Mair, Lord Lawrence, was unquestionably a remarkable man. Calcutta had little to do with the making of him; his truest claims to the gratitude of India and to the honours he received at home, rested not upon the transactions of his five years' rule there. A just estimate of the man must overlook alike the Governor-General of India and the first Chairman of the London School Board, and carry us back to the Punjaub in 1849, and to Delhi in 1857. For the true story of Lord Lawrence is the story of the annexation and settlement of the Punjaub, and the narrative of the siege of Delhi.

In spite of theories to the contrary, it is practically impossible in certain circumstances for annexation not to take place. And such were our circumstances in almost every border portion of our Indian territory, from its earliest occupation until it grew into contact with some natural boundary like a chain of mountains or the ocean, even though its progress were stayed for a time by any less formidable but convenient "scientific frontier." Such, too, is undoubtedly at present our case in the north and in the east—that is, in Afghanistan and Burmah.† And when the necessity is forced upon us in the former by some restless Ameer, such as Lord Lytton's recent despatch pictures rather than foreshadows, politicians will begin to see that semi-barbarian intermediate States need not be supported in independence of us merely as barriers to the encroachments of another civilized nation. It is, indeed, especially in reference to Russia, that a recent writer has ventured to state this truth.

* This remarkable work contains the best, one may almost say, the only published record of the early and most splendid services to India of her lately deceased ex-viceroy. Of the two Lawrences, as of Lord Canning, it may be justly styled the panegyric; but it is a panegyric which is founded upon facts stated and evidence detailed.

† "However the London papers may protest against annexation, tranquillity will only be restored in Afghan when it becomes British territory; and its last Ameer, like so many Indian Princes, draws his pension from the Viceroy's Court at Calcutta."—*Vienna Neue Freie Presse*, Sept. 6th.

He errs, however, in upholding it as self-evident, and asserting that it is accepted by all statesmen.*

Russia [he says] must push forward her frontier until she reaches a country possessing a Government which is willing and able to keep order within its boundaries, and to prevent its subjects from committing depredations on their neighbours. As none of the petty States of Central Asia seem capable of permanently fulfilling this condition, it is pretty certain that the Russian and British frontiers will one day meet. . . . As to the complications and disputes which inevitably arise between contiguous nations, I think they are fewer and less dangerous than those which arise between nations separated from each other by a small State, which is incapable of making its neutrality respected, and is kept alive simply by the mutual jealousy of rival powers.†

The history of the annexation of the Punjaub affords abundant proof of the necessity that sooner or later lies upon every civilized Power of annexing really, if not nominally, adjacent uncivilized States. In many instances we have been but too ready at this kind of work, but at the particular moment when the Punjaub and its affairs forced themselves upon our attention, annexation had become unpopular, and far from hastening it in this instance, every effort was made to retard, even if it could not ultimately avert it.

This necessity works its way and presses itself into notice through a multitude of channels, but is usually determined in the end by some event often and by many regarded as the cause, whereas in reality it has been but the accidental agent in fixing the particular date of annexation. For the real working agency, the true origin of the increasing necessity, the one cause of all annexation, is trade. No sooner is an uncivilized State approached by a civilized Power, than traders, by a law of their nature, push their way into its interior, and in spite of danger to life as well as to property, in an astonishingly brief space of time, secure a footing even amongst peoples and chiefs the most barbarous. They are ever ahead of diplomatists in new and unexplored regions, and the highways of commerce have often become well-beaten tracks ere the military power of the civilized neighbour finds itself compelled to make use of them. And what discipline and bravery gain for the soldier, a mixture of rash adventure with, one might almost say, an

* Russia and England [says the St. Petersburg *Wiedomosti* of Sept. 6th] stand facing each other. England is advancing from the south, Russia from the north. Sooner or later these two States must attack each other, for which purpose the Afghan episode will serve as a pretext. In a short time, after a few paces more have been made, there will not be a strip of ground between them, and their frontiers will touch. The contact of two such Powers as England and Russia will in time lead to such calamities as have never yet been witnessed.

† Wallace's "Russia," vol. ii. p. 440.

unparalleled effrontery, have already insured to the trader. By long experience he has sufficiently probed the depth of even the barbarian mind to know that there is cunning enough in it to see that to treat suppliers of old and inciters to new wants treacherously, is to kill the geese that lay the golden eggs. So barter and exchange become the basis of the first concessions, and concessions once granted pave the way for treaties. Commerce leads on its victim willingly to wind himself in its toils; diplomacy straightway reveals to him the mess he has got into, and points to the armed array of military force on the other side of an adjacent border, as a warning of what he has to fear if he attempts to get himself out of it. The only fact that redeems this ludicrous view of the situation is, that bad as our interference has oftentimes for many years after annexation been, it has usually put an end to a state of rule in which unheard-of atrocities were the common order of things. But it is trade that takes the start, early establishing itself upon a mixed footing of politics and barter, until at length it brings even the chiefs of the new nation within the web of the civilized spider. And then they are handed over to open their eyes, and their poor barbarian mouths too, one would think, at seeing themselves face to face with diplomacy backed by armed force, treating with them for protection to traders and facilities for their trade.

This point reached, events thicken, and the end of the story is not far distant. Princes and chieftains begin to find out that they cannot have their own despotic Eastern way with these civil but determined Western men of business. So long as they give good prices for imported wares and let valuable native products pass out of their hands in exchange for mere trifles, all goes on merrily as a marriage bell, and the inconvenience of occasional acts of robbery and even murder are condoned as things inevitable in such a hazardous pioneering profession. But as the traders increase in number and prosperity, jealousy of their power and position takes hold of at least a portion of the community, and outbursts of enmity accompanied too often with bloodshed occur. And the supreme ruler at one time is swayed by the opposers of the trading strangers, at another he inclines to favour them, especially if opportune gifts are allowed to plead with him. And so this alternating process has to have its run, until some more than ordinary outrageous attack compels the merchant-body to invoke the power of the mother country in their behalf, and then these swarthy chieftains and their counsellors are plainly told that government must be conducted by them more after the Western fashion, or they must cease to be allowed to govern at all. Indeed, they begin to find pressure put upon them, not only in reference to the intruders, but also to the inhabitants of the soil. And by way

of sharpening their memory upon the items submitted to them as practical rules for future guidance, some valuable concession to trade is usually exacted as the price of peace. Then sometimes the sovereign has the sense to submit, and to recognise in prompt submission the surest means of acquiring new and formidable allies ; sometimes he becomes restive and kicks stoutly against the civilizer's goad ; no easy task, when we consider that the said civilizer only interferes at the moment most convenient to himself, and usually most inopportune for his victim. At times, with his native cunning he pretends submission, but is wriggling meanwhile to extricate himself from the toils thrown round him to tame him, until in despair he gives full fling to his hot Eastern blood, and after a few months of fiery contest, one of his sons or neighbours has purchased our forbearance by agreement to our wishes, and has ascended the throne in his stead.

In the annexation of the Punjaub we have perhaps the most remarkable instance of the necessity alluded to, and there are few, I have already hinted, who do not know that the history of the Punjaub is the history of Lord Lawrence's best and brightest achievements.

The Punjaub Proper, as distinguished from the present province of that name, or the Land of the Five Rivers, consisted of the triangular-shaped territory between the Sutlej river with its continuation, the Beas, for its southern and south-eastern side, the Suleiman and other mountains of Afghanistan for its northern and north-western side, and the Himalaya mountains, with Cashmere, on its northern and north-eastern frontier. At the date of its annexation the Punjaub contained in its 50,000 square miles some four millions of inhabitants. For the last twenty years the Delhi and Agra territories have been added to this Province, thus doubling its extent, and raising its population to over seventeen millions.

The original Punjaub was inhabited by three distinct classes—the Mohammedans, the Hindoos, and the Sikhs. But the Sikhs, though numerically inferior to either of the others, ruled both. They were a comparatively young sect of reformed Hindoos, with one Nanuk for their first peaceful "prophet," in 1510, and Gooroo Govind for their great warlike high priest in 1700. Their power culminated under Runjeet Singh—that is, during the first forty years of the present century ; and it was at the death of this able ruler that we were first brought into serious contact with them.

During Runjeet Singh's long lifetime the army had been a willing instrument in his hands. Deprived of its master, it imitated the Prætorian guards of the later Roman Empire, and in less than four years the Sikh State had witnessed the downfall and assassination of four rulers. In 1845 the nominal

chief, or Maharaja, was the young Dhuleep Singh, but the army was really without any efficient or responsible control, and a collision between it and our troops stationed on the border of the North-Western Provinces became daily imminent. Moreover, there were not wanting Sikh politicians, by no means unfriendly to us, who were desirous of seeing their military masters weakened, if not utterly discomfited. Their efforts, therefore, to incite the soldiery to pick a quarrel with us, however complimentary to our prowess, were not long in working out their way, and at one moment seemed likely to go beyond the expectations of the intriguers; for never, perhaps, in the long and splendid history of British arms, was terrible defeat so nigh unto victory as at Ferozshukur. When 40,000 Sikhs, with 150 guns, first crossed the Sutlej to the attack, our troops numbered but 16,000, with only 70 guns. Yet, in spite of the disparity, and of the doubtful successes at Moodkee and Ferozshukur, defeat at the latter place, as has been stated, seeming at one moment almost certain, at Aliwal, in 1846, and at Sobraon, in the following month, our army prevailed; the Sikh force was utterly routed and eventually dispersed, and the road lay open to us to repair unmolested right into the capital, Lahore.

Lahore was occupied—Lahore, the home of Indian kings ere even Delhi had become the Imperial city of the Moguls—and the whole of the Punjaub lay conquered at our feet.

Lord Hardinge was at this time Governor-General of India, and he straightway issued a proclamation restoring the country to its young Maharaja, but warning what remained of the military autocracy to beware for the future. Truly, then, had we a splendid opportunity of annexing the whole Province, but the public voice had at the moment been too loud for the authorities at the India House, and any attempt to add to our already too extended Indian Empire was discountenanced. So some other plan than annexation had to be devised, and at any rate given a fair trial. The old Durbar—a council, not a person—was left, and the Executive Government of the country continued in its hands; while, to prevent the former evils of military intervention, a powerful military protectorate of British troops was established. The mother of the Maharaja was the nominal Regent, and foolishly allowed her paramour, the infamous Lal Singh, soon to become the real tyrant. Of course this state of things ended in utter failure, a failure for which we were hardly responsible. True, we stood aloof; nay, we protected those whose government was anything but a protectorate to its own subjects; but we had decided upon the Punjaub's having a trial of its old laws and rulers without the dangers from its Sikh soldiery, to which its internal anarchy had been previously attributed: and we had pledged ourselves to no

further interference. We had given our bond that we would be entirely neutral in its internal affairs, and, in spite of grievous temptation to the contrary—the sight of iniquities committed under the eyes of our warriors, and in reliance even upon their protection, the saddest of all sights to brave men—we were true to our word.

This deplorable position of our small army had certainly not been foreseen, and the earliest opportunity that presented itself was eagerly seized of withdrawing from it. At the end of one short year, the Great Seal of the Maharaja was placed by the Durbar in the hands of the British Resident. Thus ended our first substitute for annexation, and Lord Hardinge set himself to contrive another.

He was still averse from transferring the internal administration of the kingdom into British hands, but he consented to its being directed by British wisdom, and its executive as well as its fighting force overawed by British power. Until the majority of the boy Maharaja, the Punjaub was to be ruled by a Council of Regency composed of Sikh chiefs, but with the British Resident as its guiding spirit and head. This Resident at the time happened to be Henry, elder brother of Lord Lawrence. He had started life as a subaltern in the Bengal army; he had assisted Pollock in Afghanistan, had represented British interests at Nepal, and had taken a leading part in the peace negotiations after the check given to the Sikh power at Sobraon. Since then he had held the post of Minister or Resident in command of the British force at Lahore for the protection of the purely Native Government we had in vain attempted to establish. Few will be found to call in question Sir John Kaye's estimate of this admirable man.

He was eminently [says the historian] a just man, and altogether incapable of that casuistry which gives a gloss of humanity to self-seeking, and robs people for their own good. He did not look upon the misgovernment of a native State as a valid reason for the absorption of its revenues, but thought that British power might be exercised for the protection of the oppressed, and British wisdom for the instruction and reformation of their oppressors, without adding a few more thousand square miles to the area of our British possessions, and a few more millions of people to the great muster-roll of British subjects in the East.*

This new protectorate, established at the end of 1846, with "unlimited authority to direct and control every department of the State," in Henry Lawrence's hands, did its work well, too well, in fact, for the leading old Punjaubees, who found every iniquitous propensity run to earth by the Resident, and such active and intelligent subordinates as he was rapidly

* "History of the Sepoy War," vol. i. p. 9.

training to his own great mind—Edwardes and Nicholson, Reynell Taylor and Lake, Lumsden, Beecher, George Lawrence, and James Abbott, the unfortunate but heroic Vans Agnew, and Arthur Cocks. Still, the Resident was the last man in the world to flatter himself that the Punjaub was secure, and while striving to do all that in him lay to render justice to his difficult task, he plainly reported to Calcutta his grounds for suspicion.

In the autumn of 1847 Lord Hardinge ceased to be Governor-General, and Henry Lawrence's health compelled him to resign his post. Sir Frederick Currie succeeded him, and he accompanied Lord Hardinge to England. Hardly had they reached their native land before tidings of the Mooltan affair reached them. And it was clear to the sagacious mind of the late Resident that a Local Government revolt against the Sikh Council upon a question of succession duty had been seized upon by the whole Sikh people as an opportunity for shaking off the odious Feringhees, and that our second Sikh war had already commenced. Colonel Lawrence, therefore, lost no time, in spite of the precarious state of his health, in returning. And so rapid were his movements, that, leaving England at the end of October, 1849, he was with General Whish before the walls of Mooltan by the end of December. On January the 2nd, 1850, Mooltan was taken, and Lawrence joined the Commander-in-chief's headquarters in time to be present at the very doubtful victory of Chillianwallah.* Goojerat, however, on the 21st of February, completely restored Lord Gough's claim to able and cool generalship, and both Sikhs and Afghans, old enemies to each other, but now united against us, were utterly discomfited. Lord Dalhousie was now Viceroy, and a Proclamation was speedily published by him annexing the whole of the Punjaub to the British Empire in India. Henry Lawrence still thought that another chance might be given before proceeding to this final measure; but overlooking this difference of opinion between so valuable a subordinate and himself, Lord Dalhousie appointed him Chief of the Board of Administration, which was to be supreme under the Governor-General, in its sovereignty over the Province of the Punjaub, with his brother, John Lawrence, and Charles Grenville Mansel as his colleagues.

* Apropos of our recent catastrophes, the following extract will be of interest: "When darkness put an end to the confusion, all we could boast of was that the British army stood on the same ground it had occupied when the fight began. Our loss was frightful. The 24th suffered more than any other regiment. When the cessation of the strife allowed the melancholy task of collecting the dead to be undertaken, the bodies of thirteen officers of this regiment lay in stark repose on the mess-table. Other regiments suffered nearly as severely, and no result had been obtained by all this butchery."—"The Punjaub," by an Old Punjaabee, p. 31.

Henry Lawrence was a soldier, John, a civilian. It was by Henry's advice that John did not follow him into the ranks. Yet in India, in the Lawrences' young days, every military officer who sought for work and promotion speedily found himself in the thick of civil business; while every civil officer had usually to look for security to his own personal valour and the spirit of his subordinates, as much as to the oftentimes far distant European contingent of protecting troops. That the great mutiny was checked in many places and suppressed in others by civilians of the old stamp can hardly be questioned: nay, perhaps fewer instances of failure occurred when, often in the teeth of regulations, they recognised the stern necessity which compelled them to take the lead, than in those cases where the military officials had all the brunt and responsibility to themselves. And Lord Lawrence's career partook as much of the military character as his soldier brother's did of the civilian's.

Up to a certain point his career was not dissimilar to that of the thousands of other young gentlemen who looked to India as the land in which they were to earn their bread, and perhaps glory. His father had served the Company for some five-and-thirty years, and so John, the sixth out of eight children passed, probably by a Director's patronage, from Foyle College, Londonderry, to Hailebury, at the age of sixteen, in 1827. Two years later he set off for India with his brother Henry, whose furlough had expired, and was appointed assistant to the Resident at Delhi, Sir Charles Metcalfe. And at Delhi, though advanced to the post of magistrate and collector, Lord Hardinge found him, and was much impressed no less by his energy and activity in collecting and forwarding the necessary supplies, than by tokens that past experience had wonderfully improved a judgment sound at the outset. From this meeting the rapid rise of John Lawrence, until he reached the summit of Indian power and ambition simply by the force of his own great mind, may be dated. After the battle of Sobraon he was placed over the recently annexed strip of country between the Sutlej and the Beas, and in the second Sikh war all his energies were taxed to their utmost to keep his department quiet. He succeeded, however, and was rewarded, as has been already noticed, by a place at the new Board of Administration. Sir John Kaye's estimate of both brothers is, doubtless, a little overdrawn, and he shows a singular propensity to confound the lowest Evangelicism with the purest Christianity, but this is his picture of the man:—

He was emphatically a man without a weakness. Strong himself, bone and muscle, head and heart, of adamant strength, that would neither bend nor break, he expected others to be equally strong. They sighed, perhaps they inwardly protested, but they knew that the work

he exacted from them he gave, in his own person, unstintingly to the State; and they could not regard as a hard taskmaster one who tasked himself hardest of all. From moral infirmities of all kinds he appeared to be equally free. He did not even seem to be ambitious. Men said that he had no sentiment, no romance. We so often judge our neighbours wrongly in this, that I hesitate to adopt the opinion; but there was an intense reality about him, such as I have never seen equalled. He seemed to be continually toiling onwards, upwards, as if life were not meant for repose, with the grand, princely motto, "I serve," inscribed in characters of light on his forehead. He served God as unceasingly as he served the State; and set before all his countrymen in the Punjaub the true pattern of a Christian gentleman.*

This is his character, as portrayed by an intimate friend, allured, perhaps, by his own genuine personal admiration of the man from the sober path of the cold historian; but with a little toning down and a little careful covering up of the remnants of his north of Ireland early religious education, it may be taken as the acknowledged portrait of the great man who was still in the flesh when it was penned and published, and who mourned, as all readers of his marvellous but uncompleted history have mourned likewise, the writer's comparatively early departure, ere it came to his own more ripened time to pass away.

The work of the Board was divided. Henry Lawrence attended to political affairs, Charles Mansel to the judicial arrangements, and John Lawrence to the civil administration and the revenue. And soon the Province was inundated with the usual staff of subordinate Government officials, differing from officials in other parts of the Empire mainly in this, that they were picked men, selected to devote every ability and energy to making Punjaubee administration Lord Dalhousie's most successful undertaking. Several of these had been already in training under one or other of the Lawrences, others were imported from the North-Western provinces, or from still farther south. Dalhousie was determined that this his pet plan should be not only a grand success but a model for future statesmen to copy; and rose above every other feeling in his selection than pure merit. Kaye thus describes their extent and manner of their working:—

The system of administration now introduced into the Punjaub, formal and precise as it may have been when compared with the rude simplicity of the old Sikh Government, was loose and irregular in comparison with the strict procedure of the Regulation Provinces. The administrators, whether soldiers or civilians, were limited to the discharge of no particular departmental functions. They were judges, revenue-collectors, thief-catchers, diplomatists, conservancy officers, and sometimes recruiting sergeants and chaplains, all in one. Men trained

* "History of the Sepoy War," vol. i. p. 63.

in such a school as this, and under such masters as the Lawrences, became equal to any fortune, and in no conjuncture, however critical, were ever likely to fail. There was hardly one among them who did not throw his whole heart into his work; whoever thought of ease, or leisure, or any personal enjoyment, beyond that which comes from an honest sense of duty done. They lived among the people of the country, their tents open to all the points of the compass; and won by their personal bearing the confidence and the admiration of all who came within their reach. And so, far sooner than even sanguine men ventured to predict, the Punjaub began to settle down under its new rulers.*

Although placing implicit reliance upon the ability of the Board, Lord Dalhousie, by frequent visits to the several important portions of the Province, gained a clear insight into the working of his system in such skilful hands. He, however, came eventually to the conclusion that one of the points upon which he had rather taken pride as peculiarly the offspring of his own sagacious ingenuity could no longer be maintained. The triumvirate must be dissolved. As in the other Provinces, there must for the future be but one responsible chief. And then the delicate question arose, and throughout India was

* "History of the Sepoy War," vol. i. p. 55. In the early stages of government by a civilized, in place of an uncivilized Power, such officials are undoubtedly the best, but it is questionable whether the system would answer at any subsequent stage. There can, however, be no doubt about the advantages to the officials themselves. While Kaye, as the panegyrist of the Lawrences, fixes his eye on the bright side, another writer directs attention to the darker spots in the system. "In the Punjaub," he says, "a mixed system prevails. . . . The judges of the courts below are all officers, many of them taken from the army, who are in the active discharge of executive functions. . . . A vast number of the judiciary body need not have had a professional training, need not have the whole of their time and powers devoted to administering justice, and are liable to have their attention distracted, and perhaps their fairness warped, by the multifarious duties of a chief constable, a land bailiff, a road trustee, and a municipal commissioner."—"Keene's Indian Administration" p. 75. And again: "I have above expressed my sense of the weakness introduced into our judicial system by the blending of functions in the case at least of the higher European officials, which was perhaps unavoidable in the rough-and-ready administration of newly acquired territory. But this, as society grows, is felt a particular, not to say insurmountable, obstacle to efficiency in the department that we are now considering. It seems at first sight bad enough that an officer should be called upon to decide upon the dispute of landlord and tenant, or to dispose of nice technicalities in the penal code, at a time when his prospects in the service depend upon his making good roads, and keeping down the inefficient balance in his treasury. But it is still worse, and a scandal to our system, that he may also be in charge of the police of his district or his sub-division, appears, as it were, as a party in his own court, and condemns the prisoner whom his own detective energies have, rightly or wrongly, placed at the bar."—p. 85.

warmly discussed, as to which of the two brothers he would choose. It had long been known that united in heart and in high resolves for India's greatest good as these brothers had ever been, differences of opinion upon important matters mainly affecting concessions to the Sirdars that seriously affected the revenue, had from the beginning existed. John Lawrence, as it would seem by a law of his strict and severe nature, had strongly upheld the policy which dealt harsher measures to the natives than his more gentle brother could approve. As a matter of fact, John's plans would, doubtless, benefit the Imperial exchequer; Henry's would, as certainly, have the opposite effect. It is equally certain that both brothers regarded the fiscal consequences of their separate lines of conduct as mere accidents, and that Henry never for a moment suspected his brother, much less openly taxed him with any ulterior ends in thus making his administration acceptable from an important, and in the eyes of many the most important, particular.

Nor, although Lord Dalhousie no doubt gave due and proper consideration to this point of difference between the opposing lines of conduct the two conscientious brothers had felt themselves, by a kind of law of their respective natures, to pursue, can it be fairly said that the money consideration was paramount in his mind. The fact was that John Lawrence's training had fitted him for the post of sole administrator, considering the then state of the Punjaub, in a way which Henry could scarcely lay claim to. Moreover, since the Board had been formed, that portion of the administration which required most attention, most energy, most delicacy, and most determination, yet which came most within the civilian's province, had been John's almost exclusive concern. So the political department was allowed to blend with the civil, and the judicial to become subordinate to it. John Lawrence, by a decree issued in 1853, was made first Lieutenant-Governor, or Chief Commissioner, and Mr. Montgomery, successor to Mr. Mansel as third member of the Board, became Judicial Commissioner. Henry Lawrence went south to the honourable appointment, more in keeping with his military capacity, of Governor-General's agent in Rajpootana. But the blow was a severe one. To the last he felt its effects. Looking at things in the light of history, there can be no doubt that Lord Dalhousie's judgment of the two men was correct. Yet, painful as the step of removal from his beloved Punjaub was to the susceptible heart of the elder, neither that nor the divergence of opinion which led up to, and probably brought it about, seems ever to have fostered any hostile or even unpleasant social feelings between the brothers.

Left thus alone to carry out single-handed Lord Dalhousie's

policy, John Lawrence did it with all the energy of his heart and soul, and he did it "because he believed in that policy." And, all things considered, it was better that he should rule alone. The very deep respect and ardent affection he ever felt for his brother, and evinced towards him, were serious impediments to the full and unfettered display of his splendid powers, so long as he was bound to regard that brother as something more than an equal on the Board of Administration. Thus, luckily for our position in the terrible conflict that was to come, John Lawrence had four years in which to render the Punjaub people familiar with the advantages of our rule, and to raise in his own person and in those of his chief colleagues so many towers of strength to aid us, or, as is generally and truthfully believed, to save us in the coming struggle. He had worked out his own way with the Province; it was now to be seen whether that way had been based upon sound principle and pursued with vigour to a successful end. The severity of the test served but to make clear as noonday the real nature of the bygone years of anxious labour. No sooner had the mutiny commenced than Lord Canning looked to Sir John Lawrence both for the advice and the assistance which he needed to quell it, and if there could possibly be any counteracting joy in the sad tale as it reached these shores, it arose with the thought that fortunately it had broken out as nigh as possible to the fittest man in India to subdue it.

At this perilous moment Henry Lawrence was Chief Commissioner at Oude, and resided at Lucknow; his brother had strongly recommended him to Lord Canning as the fittest man to be Commander-in-Chief in the Persian War; but the Home Authorities at Downing Street had resolved that to James Outram this important charge should be confided, and Canning, with his usual sense, allowed this substantial interference with his prerogative to pass without protest. Moreover, ably seconded by Sir John Lawrence and Herbert Edwardes, he soon brought about an alliance with Dost Mahomed, thus bringing a pressure to bear against Persia from Afghanistan. Thus, as the momentous time arrived, by a series of appointments and arrangements, the main benefit of which has been wholly unforeseen, John Lawrence had firmly established British rule and his own position throughout the Punjaub; Henry Lawrence was in the capital of the most recently annexed and adjoining Province; Outram was rapidly bringing the Persian War to a close, thereby insuring the succour of his troops and of his own great genius at the critical juncture; and the

* Kaye, *ibid.*, p. 63.

only chief who might have impeded Sir John Lawrence in the devotion with which he stripped the Punjaub of almost every arm upon which he could rely, had been quietly bought over by a few thousand stands of arms, and a yearly supply of twelve lakhs per annum so long as the Persian War should continue. This, to us, as it so happened, most providential treaty, was signed on January the 27th, 1857, and to Dost Mahomed's honour, was faithfully kept. All the credit of it was due to Lawrence and Edwardes. In the April following, Sir Henry Lawrence wrote a long letter to the Governor-General, telling of his suspicions as to intrigues between the regular Sepoys and the irregular forces from the late King of Oude's old army, as well as certain members of the native police. But with his old antipathies to annexation and its consequences, he concluded with laments which probably lessened the weight of his predictions in the mind even of such an admirer as Lord Canning. The real outbreak of the Mutiny is usually ascribed to Meerut; but there can be no doubt as to the strong symptoms of it which had occurred a week previously in Oude. There the flame had been stifled rather than quenched, and the Chief Commissioner's propositions for the future were under discussion at Calcutta.

On the 11th of May a telegram passed from Agra to Calcutta—that is, from Lieutenant-Governor Colvin to Lord Canning. It ran as thus—

Last night, at nine o'clock, a telegraph message was received here by a lady from her niece, sister of the postmaster at Meerut, to the following effect: 'The cavalry have risen, setting fire to their own houses and several officers' houses, besides having killed and wounded all European officers and soldiers they could find near the lines. If aunt intends starting to-morrow evening, please detain her from doing so, as the van has been prevented from leaving the station.' No later message has been received, and the communication by telegram has been interrupted; how not known. Any intelligence which may reach will be sent on immediately.

The next intelligence that did reach was, that the Mutiny had spread from Meerut to Delhi, which had fallen with its not very reluctant king into the hands of the mutineers; and this was sent on by telegram to Calcutta on the 14th. How it came about that the only use made of the Meerut and Agra wire was the accidental message of a young lady consequent upon the purely accidental intended journey of an aged aunt, I have not yet seen accounted for. Nor why the Meerut mutineers were not followed up to the gates of Delhi by our dragoons, has any satisfactory explanation been given. General Hewitt, in his own easy, drowsy way, quietly laid the blame at his sub-

ordinate, Brigadier Wilson's door. Sir John Kaye, while justly defending Wilson at Hewitt's expense, attributes all the mischief to the easy-going, "All Serene" system which damned every precaution or hint of uneasiness with the faint praise of *trop de zèle*. It has even been asserted, and upon seemingly good grounds, that the insurrection at Meerut, notwithstanding its immediate vicinity to Delhi and the escape of the mutineers to the Imperial city, was a signal blessing, as it split up into a series of small revolts what would have ripened into one huge, destructive, preconcerted rebellion about a fortnight later. Be that as it may, the case was bad enough. By the end of May it had gone forth throughout the land that Delhi had been lost to us, its king proclaimed supreme in our place, and every native regiment was by a secret, but never-failing agency, incited to rise and throw off the hated white man's yoke.

But the white man was on the alert. The greatness of the danger had called into action the greatness of his valour and of his ability to meet the worst. The regiments under Lord Elgin were signalled *en route* to China, and diverted to India's more pressing needs. Urgent appeals for instant succour were despatched to England. The Governor-General's personal attention was devoted to every—and they seemed numberless—station where the old protection had become a formidable element of weakness. Every European soldier that could be spared was posted upwards to the North-west, and the two watchwords sent right and left wherever trouble had appeared or was feared were—"Disarm the Native Regiments" and "Hold on until succour arrives." It has been said that, when the Mutiny broke out, among other remarkable sources of strength ready or within reach of the Governor-General were the two brothers Lawrence. Of Henry's failure in the present conjuncture there can hardly, in spite of Sir John Kaye's strong advocacy, be two opinions. Up to the moment of the outbreak he had been, as Chief Commissioner, a valuable assistant. But whether by reason of his failing health or by reason of the softness attendant upon increasing years acting upon a peculiarly gentle nature, he failed as all others failed who ventured in this particular to set their own judgment against the decision promulgated from the seat of Government, in the first and as it subsequently proved, the most efficient counter-agency to the revolt—disarming the Sepoys. But speedily shut up in Lucknow, utterly routed at the battle of Chinhut, and at length mortally wounded by a shell which had been fired into his chamber, Henry Lawrence died on the 4th of July. Lord Canning's despatch recording the Minute of his death

tersely embodies the character and the precise estimate of the man. "He would have been invaluable in the pacification of the troubled districts hereafter, both as a soldier and a civilian." But while the elder brother was being sorrowfully laid in his grave at Lucknow, the terrible events following upon each other in such cruel and quick succession, had wrought upon the younger in altogether another way. Far from depressing, much less subduing, the energy of his spirit, they had nerved him to a vigour which had previously been acknowledged to be indomitable, and now appeared plainly as irresistible.

The State of the Punjaub was briefly this: Its two principal portions of the population were the Mohammedans and the Hindoos, both heretofore domineered over by the Sikhs. Notwithstanding all his labours to benefit the masses, Sir John Lawrence never for one moment supposed that in seven years a conquered people could learn to prefer the rule of a foreign race to the rule of the warlike contingent of their native soil. It is difficult to explain, but peoples, like maltreated wives, prefer being beaten by their own than to have their stripes healed at the hands of a stranger. But fortunately he saw that there was not only little love lost between the warlike Sikhs and their effeminate countrymen, but that sundry prophecies had foretold that a Sikh army should one day sack Delhi. Again, so recent had been the annexation of the Punjaub, and so much more recent Dost Mahomed's alliance, that, comparatively speaking, the country was full of European troops. It had also, under Neville Chamberlain, the famous Irregular Force, which the foresight and sagacity of the Governor had embodied as a useful arm in case of work beyond the borders, and a safety-valve at home for the explosive spirit of the old Sikh soldiery.

When tidings of the Meerut disaster reached Lahore, on May 12th, the Lieutenant-Governor was wending his way to the cool heights in the neighbourhood of Cashmere, striving by this partial repose to avert his physician's decision that a sojourn in England was essential to the prolongation of his life. But in his Chief Commissioner at Lahore, an old schoolmate at Londonderry and his former companion on the Board, Robert Montgomery; in Brigadier Stuart Corbett, commanding-officer at the military station of Meean-Meer, some six miles distant; and in Colonel Renny, of Her Majesty's 81st Foot, he had assistants upon whom he could implicitly rely. It took little time to make him and his chief subordinates aware that the Sepoys were not to be trusted; and so with wonderful swiftness and consummate tact they were to a man disarmed, and the fort quickly garrisoned by three companies of the 81st. The next place to look to was the great sacred city of the Punjaub, the abode of thousands of the most influential members of

the priesthood, Umritsur. Under the active care of a civil-service official, Mr. Cooper, aided by one company of the ubiquitous 81st, this important town, with its fort, was rendered safe. The great military store towns, too, Ferozepore and Phillur, were also placed under the control of Europeans, the former, almost in spite of the Commanding-Officer's incapacity, which took refuge in a half-measure which had well-nigh ended in complete destruction, the latter, by the intrepidity of a subaltern, and the timely aid despatched from the great neighbouring military station of Jullundhur, by almost simultaneous orders from Sir John Lawrence and the Commander-in-Chief, General Anson. Phillur has been styled the "Key of the Punjaub;" and it became subsequently the grand dépôt where succour for the in turn besiegers and besieged on the ridge before Delhi, were collected and forwarded. But the weak point of the Punjaub was Peshawur. We had an army there of over twelve thousand men, but of these the two thousand five hundred Europeans, and Captain Daly's famous Guide Corps of a thousand strong, were the only ones who could be trusted. And we did not know then, Sir John Lawrence could not know, whether or not Dost Mahomed would prove faithful. But Herbert Edwardes was Chief Commissioner there, John Nicholson Deputy Commissioner, and Sydney Cotton Brigadier in command. Neville Chamberlain shortly joined them, and at a Council of War it was determined to establish a strong movable column for the protection of the Punjaub, which might pounce down instantaneously upon any mutinous native regiment, and by summary vengeance awe the rest into quiet. Chamberlain was appointed to the command. And the moment these measures had been completed the Lieutenant-Governor took in hand the great work of his life.

It is Lord Lawrence's special claim to gratitude and glory that in this terrible conjuncture he rose beyond petty routine and be-safe-at-any-price consideration. While men of an inferior stamp, and less far-seeing vision, would have left Imperial duties to the Governor-General, and congratulated themselves as model public servants if their own departments were kept in control, Lord Lawrence recognised the whole vast extent of the danger, and saw that the greatest crisis in India's history had suddenly come upon her. The Mogul Standard was floating from the walls of Imperial Delhi, where, in defiance of the white man, an Eastern monarch had mounted his ancestral throne. The old associations of Delhi gave its position in the struggle a deep significance—and two men saw this at the outset—Lord Canning, and fortunately for the success of Lord Canning's efforts, Sir John Lawrence.

In the hottest season of the year Daly, with his Guides,

marched from Peshawur to Delhi, nearly six hundred miles, in twenty-two days, doing good service by the way at Mushera, Attock, Goodhianah, and Kurnaul. "Their stately height," says one who witnessed their arrival, "and military bearing, made all who saw them proud to have such aid." They were mostly of Afghan or Persian race. Then, taking advantage of the known hostility between the Sikhs and Hindoos, the former were speedily, by the Lieutenant-Governor's orders, taken from their own Sepoy regiments and formed into separate bodies, as being more true to us, and hence serviceable against mutinous regiments, and for the great work at Delhi. Local levies were raised, the police strengthened and kept active, and the treasure, which was so much more needed because looted lower south by the mutineers, placed everywhere under European care. But it soon became clear that the native regiments must be disarmed at Peshawur, and a terrible example made of the would-be ringleaders. Sir John Kaye passes by the terrible "punishment-parade" of the 10th of June almost without note, and with but this significant comment: "It is hard to say how many lives—the lives of men of all races, were saved by the seeming severity of this early execution." But it is pretty certain that had the Punjaub not been speedily made safe from internal dangers, Delhi could not have been reduced, and that so long as Delhi held out, and its king reigned within only its walls, the mutineers had throughout the vast empire a centre to point to, and a monarch to pretend to serve. Sir John Lawrence saw all this *then* as we see it now, and with all his brother Henry's mild influence over Sikhs, and even Hindoos, it was perhaps well that the disarmer and avenger, and not the pacificator, was at the moment in supreme command. But the internal troubles were not so speedily, even by such a strong hand, surmounted. There were revolts at Jullundhur, at Goodhianah, which, indeed, was for a time in the mutineers' hands, and on the frontier none, perhaps, but a Nicholson could have kept the risings down. In spite of all, however, the Lieutenant-Governor's eye was upon the right spot—beyond the Punjaub frontier; and in Kaye's words:—

There were unceasing efforts all along the great road to Delhi to furnish the means of transporting stores for the service of Barnard's army. In this most essential work civil and military officers worked manfully together; and, although there were many difficulties to be overcome, the great thoroughfare was soon alive with carts and carriages and beasts of burden conveying downwards all that was most needed by the army, and especially, those vast supplies of ordnance and ammunition which were required to make an impression on the walls of the city which we were besieging. It is hard to say what might

not have befallen us if, at this time, the road had not been kept open ; but the loyalty of the great chiefs of the protected Sikh States, and the energy and sagacity of Barnes and Ricketts, secured our communications, and never was the Delhi Field Force in any danger of the interception of its supplies.*

That General Wilson recognised Sir John Lawrence's vigour in all this, he took care to let the world, as well as the Lieutenant-Governor himself know ; but there are many who, in the most important item of all—that is, in the aid afforded by these Sikh States, recognise simply the results of Henry Lawrence's policy and the personal influence gained by him over them ; an influence in which, part at least, passed from him to his brother.

Handing over his movable column to Nicholson, Neville Chamberlain had led every European and native in the Punjaub that could be spared and trusted to Delhi, where his arrival was thus alluded to by General Sir Henry Barnard :—"My position is difficult, and not the less so for its undefined responsibilities, which must always be the case when a commander-in-chief is in the same field. But the valuable assistance you have given me in Brigadier-General Chamberlain will henceforward greatly lighten my anxieties." This he wrote on June 24th, to the great, and at the time only, promoter of the one grand step towards crushing the rebellion, Sir John Lawrence, with whom, as was but natural, all the leading officials before the city kept up a brisk correspondence. He, and he alone, knew every item of the difficulties to be encountered. Each in his own department described them ; he considered them, and pushed onwards aid that was recognised throughout the camp as providential and complete.

At this time, July 3rd, there had reached Delhi from the Punjaub alone, the headquarters of her Majesty's 8th Foot, the headquarters of the 61st Foot, the 1st Regiment of Punjaub infantry, a squadron of Punjaub Cavalry, two guns of European and two of Native Horse Artillery, some European reserve artillery, and some much-needed Sikh gunners. All these, in addition to the detachment brought by Chamberlain, and Daly's Guides.

Thus, with troops to the number of nearly 7000, Barnard was again pressed to try what had come to be styled "The Gambler's Throw," and to take the city by a *coup de main*. But, again, the preparations were made, and at the last moment the attempt was abandoned ; and Barnard, as usual, wrote in explanation to the keen watchman at Rawul Pindee his reasons for further delay. And soon, worn out by the double pressure

* "History of the Sepoy War," vol. ii. p. 510.

of anxiety and ill-health, unrelieved by Nature's sweet restorer, sleep, struck down by cholera, the Commander of the Delhi Field Force passed away, loved, respected, and deeply-lamented by all, and the great duty fell to the lot of General Reed.

But Reed had an assistant, who arrived too late to share much of the anxious toil with his predecessor. This was the chief engineer, Baird Smith. Baird Smith, however, found his supplies of shot, shell, and guns so ludicrously inadequate for a siege that, before July had come to an end, reports were in circulation that the project of capturing the city must, for the moment, be abandoned, and the British force before it withdrawn. Meanwhile Reed was so broken in health that he resigned the command to Brigadier Archdale Wilson, and Baird Smith, who was the first to see clearly the great defects of the siege train, but had not shut his eyes to the magnitude of the evil it would be to withdraw, remonstrated, with all the earnestness of his nature, against such a step. And so, as Barnard and as Reed had done, straightway wrote Wilson to Sir John Lawrence, and he wrote not in vain. The aid demanded by the chief engineer was promised, and to work went Lawrence that his promise should be speedily fulfilled, for he "had ever held fast to the opinion that the recovery of Delhi was an object of such magnitude that all else was dwarfed beside it."*

Indeed, he had almost committed himself to positive injunctions to his subordinates to abandon the Peshawur Valley, with Peshawur itself, to Dost Mahomed, in spite of the earnest protestations of Cotton, Edwardes, Nicholson, James, and the Lumsdens, these last speaking from Afghanistan, and of the effects of such a measure upon the Afghan tribes. Lord Canning's peremptory refusal came in time to save such a fatal dismemberment of the Empire, and, as it would seem, Sir John Lawrence's reputation. His subordinates, it is true, were held by him to have naturally too keen an eye to their own districts, while he himself could and did look beyond the Punjaub, and determined upon action that had the safety of the whole Empire for its result. That action was, as we have seen, confined for the moment—in fact, centred upon—the capture of Delhi. In this the Lieutenant-Governor, doubtless, saw further than his subordinates, but he did not see far enough. One placed on a higher eminence rose equal to the occasion, and took in the whole of what even Sir John Lawrence saw but a part. It is unquestionable that Sir John was a far-seeing, capable man, well fitted for command; it is equally unquestionable that Lord Canning showed himself his superior, and proved his ability for Imperial rule.

* "Sepoy War," vol. ii. p. 608.

But, Peshawur or no Peshawur, Lawrence had determined that Delhi must fall ; and so, in spite of outbreaks up and down among the Sepoys, by the end of July he had despatched over 4000 picked troops, nearly 1000 of them Europeans, to take part in the great siege. Upon Nicholson he had, upon his own authority, conferred the title of Brigadier-General, and sent him at the head of the reinforcements. They reached the Ridge on the 14th of August, having, under Nicholson, completely routed the desperate efforts of the mutineers to intercept the siege train, which was slowly following in its rear. Early in September every promised succour had arrived. If the splendid reinforcements, furnished almost exclusively from the Punjaub, could not enable our army to accomplish its task, then, and then only, would the Chief Commissioner's policy have lain open to the charge of failure. But he had determined that it should succeed, and had sent on the two young generals he had himself raised to rank and entrusted with high command, and upon whom he relied for the success that he felt *ought* to follow upon his own extensive preparations.

This is hardly a history of the actual capture of the city ; it purports but to throw light upon the claims of the late Lord Lawrence to the gratitude of his countrymen as one of the saviours of India at her most critical conjuncture. Those claims are intimately connected with the foresight with which he recognised the one great and immediate necessary undertaking, and the untiring energy with which he devoted himself to accomplish it, at the risk even of the destruction of all order and rule in the one great province it was his especial duty to govern. By the beginning of September the last instalment of men and means had arrived ; by the 23rd the capture of the city and the complete overthrow of the Mogul temporary empire and the Sepoy temporary power were accomplished facts, and all this ere the slightest help had arrived from home. Broken thus in the north, with signs of terrible vengeance in the strong reinforcements that were being rapidly pushed up the country from Calcutta, the spirit of the mutiny began to be overpowered, and was, as we know in the end, crushed out. But the turning point in our favour was the fall of Delhi, and to John Lawrence pre-eminently that fall was mainly due.

No sooner had quiet returned to the Empire than Sir John Lawrence quitted India for retirement in his native land, still continuing, however, his services to the country of his adoption as a member of the Council which was to assist the new Minister for India to govern the vast territories just ceded by the old Company to the Crown. Meanwhile, his splendid services in the late mutiny met with rewards both honourable and

substantial. He was made a baronet, a G.C.B., and a Privy Councillor; and a handsome pension for two lives was conferred upon him. Finally, in 1864, Lord Palmerston appointed him Viceroy of India in succession to Lord Elgin, who had just succumbed to the ill effects of an Eastern clime, after less than two years' rule.

But as Viceroy Sir John Lawrence's story must be read under the light of recent frontier events—notably the late Afghan War. I do not know who the "Old Punjaabee" so frequently quoted in this and a preceding Article is, but two things are clear from his narrative: first, that in his capacity of an official in the neighbourhood of Afghanistan he had made himself thoroughly conversant with the mutual relations and positions of the British, Russian, and Afghan powers; and, secondly, that he plainly foresaw the evil effects of the Viceroy's "masterly inactivity," and sketched the very policy pursued by the present Government, but condemned so strenuously by Lord Lawrence, as the only means of preserving our Indian frontier safe from Russian intrigue. According to him, Lord Lawrence was infatuated with the "conciliation policy." And yet it can now be scarcely called in question that the recent success of our arms and negotiations are complete replies to his prophecies of Afghan irresistible opposition and permanent alienation.

To the last the late peer was as active-minded and earnest as of old; from his place in the House of Lords, taking the lead in all discussions of Indian business, and as Chairman of the first London School Board showing an energy, if not an ability, in discussing the minute questions referring to the education of the poor, as marvellous as it was in strange contrast to those exalted powers which had enabled him to settle a distracted and conquered kingdom, to crush a frightful rebellion, and to govern a mighty Empire.

Yet the one misfortune of a most fortunate life had for years fallen upon him. In a letter to Edwardes, dated May 13th, 1857, he wrote: "I have been unwell and unable to write. The night before last I put some aconite on my temple. It is a deadly poison. In the night it worked into my eye, and I was nearly blinded."* Towards the end, he was entirely bereft of sight, and thus—

Wisdom at one entrance quite shut out.

But he was supported to the end by a strong sense of religion, and was blessed with a happy home. Humanly speaking, however, the two brothers seemed to have died less at the wrong time than at each other's time. Had Henry survived he would

certainly have followed Lord Canning as Viceroy. He had, but the gratifying intelligence never reached him, been appointed to the high post provisionally, if during the heat of the great mutiny Lord Canning should fail. And no man's highest powers would have ever had grander field for display than Henry Lawrence's as Viceroy after the Mutiny, bringing to the hut of every peasant, or to the palace of every prince, plain proofs of the power and yet of the justice and mercy of British rule. But he was laid low at Lucknow, and his own last words, which justly figure upon the simple slab over his remains, best describe alike his modesty and his unfulfilled career—"He tried to do his duty." Had John Lawrence, on the other hand, met with a soldier's death, like Nicholson, when success at Delhi was assured and complete, the story of his splendid services would not be prolonged until it reached the point where party spirit cannot fail to intrude, and where it begins to grow tiresome to all, and at times even painful to the Catholic reader.

E.



ART. VIII.—OUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND THEIR WORK.

1. *Religion for Children.* An Address Delivered at the Opening of the School at Aberkenfig, by the RIGHT REV. BISHOP HEDLEY. Burns & Oates. 1879.
2. *Notes on the Education Question.* By the RIGHT REV. BISHOP ULLATHORNE. Richardson & Sons. 1857.

AN Article in our April number, on the School Boards, has given occasion to a renewal of the controversy on that much-debated subject. Strong letters, and even fierce, have been written on both sides; though many others probably, besides the writer in the *Tablet*, have remarked on the lamentable ignorance of the subject betrayed by some who were fiercest in their denunciation of the Board schools. One of the writers twitted his opponent with quoting the "authority" of the DUBLIN REVIEW, which did not seem to us to have been quite "good form," for we expressly disclaimed the intention of laying down the law or doing anything more than setting forth what might be said on the question. Our position was, and is, that the matter belongs, not to private individuals to determine, but to the ecclesiastical superiors set over us by the Holy See. If they have not seen cause to pronounce the question a closed one, no one has a right to upbraid another with not taking his own view of the matter.

Another thing has no doubt been remarked by others as well as ourselves. The writers who from the repose of their study have declaimed so fiercely against Board schools, and the "Government system," and quoted strong words from episcopal speeches or sermons against the evil of secular or godless education—what programme have they put forth of the course they would themselves adopt? We cannot remember to have come across any proposed plan of action to be substituted for the system they desire to sweep away. A man who stood by when work was going on, and spoke loudly on the faulty and unworkmanlike way in which the thing was being done, would certainly be expected to say how it would be done better. As one of the workmen, we might in this case reply: I go a long way with you in the truth of your objections; but will you kindly say, considering that the work has to be done, what is the better way in which you would propose to do it? not, mind you, to leave it undone.

We do not, however, propose (though we are courteously invited to do so) to continue this controversy, but to speak now on a different and more practical question—viz. Our own schools: and by them we mean, not such as are under the management of School Boards, but under the management of Catholics; chiefly, indeed, of Catholic Priests. Before doing so, however, we may fitly say a word or two on a fresh point that has risen out of the controversy. This is the question as to Catholic teachers taking Board schools. A note of alarm has been sounded in one or two of the Papers, as if this was being done to a considerable extent, and we were in danger of losing our best teachers in this way, after going to the trouble and expense of training them for our own schools, while, on the other hand, we find teachers threatening to take Board schools, and speaking in terms of some bitterness of there being any attempt to prevent them.

We cannot see any cause for anxiety either on one side or the other. There are, no doubt, cases of Catholic teachers taking Board schools, but we think that on examination it will be found that they are not very numerous. Teachers seem sometimes to speak as if they were sacrificing themselves in remaining to teach our schools, and as if they had nothing else to do than to consent to take Board schools, and they would be well enough off. This is talking a little too fast. In how many instances have Catholic teachers been offered the charge of a Board school? Some few cases, from exceptional causes, no doubt exist; but we believe that what is offered to them is not the charge of a Board school as head teacher, but employment as assistants under the head teacher; and this is not a position of such attractiveness

that we need fear our best teachers being lured away by it. We think, moreover, that really good teachers, whose value to us is above gold, are not the ones that would be willing, under ordinary circumstances, to accept employment which gave no scope for the exercise of their high vocation of helping on the great work of Christian education.

Pass we now from an unpractical discussion to a more practical one. For whatever may be thought of Board schools, it is of no use to talk as if the question was in our hands. Were we ever so unanimous in our condemnation of them, they would still exist, unless we could obtain an alteration in the law and a change in public opinion. There they are, and wishing things otherwise will not change our position. The question is only a practical one in so far as relates to how to make the best of a state of things which exists whether we will or no. But if we turn to our own schools, the discussion is of a very practical character, because they are in our own hands. What character they shall take rests with ourselves. Their Managers are not a School Board, but the Priest or Priests of the Mission, with perhaps one or two of the most earnest and zealous members of its congregation. And all the power—and even more—which the School Board has over Board schools, that our Managers have over our schools. They are responsible for the regulations of the school, for the kind of teachers who are placed in charge, and for the payment of all expenses. They can visit the school at all times, and see how the work is being done. They can control, amend, change, or sanction at their discretion. Opinions have indeed been freely expressed to the effect that this state of things is only transient; that the power of controlling our own schools will shortly be taken from us. If this is indeed so, it is a very strong reason for making the utmost use of the power while it still remains to us. Its being efficiently and intelligently exercised may have considerable influence, as we hope to show, on its being left in our hands. For ourselves, we are not at all sure that the tendency of things just now is in the direction of these gloomy anticipations. We continually see political prognostication at fault, and adhere to the saying of a sagacious old statesman, that in politics, the only thing certain is, that *nobody* knows what is going to happen.

Having then to deal with a present question and a practical question concerning our own schools, the work they have to do, and our prospects of succeeding in it, we dismiss the subject of Board schools and propose to make some remarks and reflections for the consideration of those who are responsible for the management of our own schools, or interested in their success. The

subjects to which we would call attention are the three questions : 1. What is the work that we want to do in our schools? 2. Is it possible to carry on this work in schools receiving Government aid? 3. What are our prospects of success?

The first question might seem to be too plain to require an answer; yet we are not certain that the same answer would be given by all. It is plain at the outset that the *raison d'être* of our schools is to take care of our own children—to provide adequate Catholic education, that they may not be drawn or driven to other schools. To effect this, we have, it is said, to compete with Board schools. But to compete in what? We cannot hope to compete with them as to their buildings, or outfit, or the superior advantages that they can offer to teachers or children through having the resources of public money at their command. In these respects they can do things on a scale which must outstrip the ordinary capability of denominational schools. The latter may, indeed, be equal to the Board schools in the secular education which they give, but they start at a manifest disadvantage in having smaller resources. Moreover the great majority of people only look to outward appearances; in fact, they have ordinarily nothing else to judge by. Hence those who only look to providing for the secular education of their children will obviously be attracted to those schools which have the most imposing appearance, which are great public institutions, and which will undoubtedly have much to offer, as time goes on, in the way of prizes and prospects for those who are successful in them. So far, then, as it is simply and purely a race between Denominational and Board schools, in secular education, the latter must win. Not because the secular education they give must necessarily be better, but because it will be popularly thought to be better, and therefore they will get the children.

But, it will be said, Catholic parents will not send their children to Board schools when they can send them to Catholic schools. We admit it. But observe, this is an admission that we have another element to take into account besides mere secular proficiency, in our competition with Board schools. It is, then, not simply a question of which is best in secular instruction. We have to depend for success on something outside the actual education given—viz., on the conscientiousness and good principles of the parents, which will lead them to make what will often seem to them a sacrifice of temporal advantage for the sake of religion. Can we depend on them to do this? Well, this is one reason, it is said, why we must look well to the secular education, that they may not be called on to make any real sacrifice, and that we may minimize the temptation and

apparent sacrifice. But then there comes in this unsatisfactory consideration, that one great reason why school education is so important for us is, that a great many of our people are not what they ought to be, and we want to rear a rising generation with better principles and stronger religious convictions than their parents. And so we are landed in a sort of vicious circle. Our hope of improving the family is in the education of the children. Yet, to get hold of the children at all we must depend on the religious principles of the existing families.

This is not altogether a promising state of things. But one point emerges from the gloom with increasing clearness; that what our schools have to do in order to success is not merely to compete with Board schools in secular education, but to do something which Board schools are not attempting to do at all. Our success in getting hold of the children at all, depends on our appealing, not to the secular element, but to the religious principles of our people. To come before them as worthy competitors with the Board schools in secular advantages is not only impolitic, because they might disagree with us, but it is dangerous, as appealing to that very secular spirit which creates the mischief. The strength of our position is in having something valuable to give which cannot be got in mere secular schools. But to do this with success we must take care that this something is a real, prominent and distinguishing feature of our schools. And this for another and still more important reason; because it is on this part of our educational system that we depend, not only to preserve our present race of Catholics, but to improve the future breed.

A third reason of no little weight shall be referred to later on, but we must not suffer it to interrupt us in considering a little more carefully, and at length, the question of what it is that we are expecting our schools to do. We are looking to them to do the principal share of the work of preserving the faith of the rising generation, and raising them to a higher standard of morality and a higher position socially. This is a great deal to expect from our schools. It is expecting of them to do what is the proper duty of the parents. But we cannot leave it to the parents; for it is the painful fact that the homes of the children, and the example of the parents, are so frequently anything but what they should be, that makes the school of so much consequence, as being ordinarily the *only* means of good influence within our reach. We are by no means denying the very difficult character of the work which we expect our teachers to do. But in the present emergency can any other means be suggested which offers anything like equal chances of success, notwithstanding the difficulties?

Before passing on let us spend a few moments in looking these difficulties in the face. The children whom we desire to educate are exposed to two dangers—of faith and of morals. The circumstances of different localities are of course various, so that they may be much more liable to these dangers in one place than in another. Yet they are almost always exposed to one of them; often to both. The danger to faith is generally the least of the two, because it is chiefly an outdoor danger, and children are not so apt to take their ways and ideas from those without, whom they often regard with fear and mistrust, as from those who protect and provide for them at home. Yet as they come to leave home, whether for work, school, or companionship, they cannot but hear and see many things dangerous to faith. What they have learnt to look on as the one truth, is treated as false or foolish. They are pointed at and laughed at for believing it. They come to realize that great numbers of those they encounter do not believe it. More dangerous than this is the fact brought home to their notice, that few men act or talk religiously, but slight or ignore the truths of religion in their daily life. The children seldom hear or see anything to back up or sustain their religious belief. They are exposed to a great deal that shocks it rudely. It cannot be such an important matter, since most people do not care about it. And they too often seem led to the same conclusion by what they see even at home. Then as they get older they read books and newspapers, and come across something that suggests a doubt. Some one has told one of his companions that there is no hell at all—it is only made up to frighten people; or he reads that it is old women and children who believe such tales. He comes to think that it is manly to slight and sneer at religion. Some fine fellow, the hero of an adventure, or the leading spirit of the neighbourhood, tells him it is nonsense, and that he must give up believing like a child, and must be like the rest of the world. All this is what tens of thousands of our children are exposed to in this country. And what is to support them in the struggle, and instill contrary principles into them? Home influence is the ordinary safeguard against being led away by such evil influences. But the badness of the homes is the very thing we have to complain of. The home is not the remedy in our case, but more often the cause of fresh danger. What else have we to look to but the school, as a counteracting influence against the danger to the child's faith? What else gives hope of stopping a silent but perpetual drain from our ranks into the swelling torrent of practical, or even professed, infidelity?

But this is only half, and that the least half, of the difficulty against which the school work is expected to make head. At present the homes of our children are not generally tainted with

unbelief. This is rather an outdoor danger. But besides this our children have the difficulty of the poor fellow who graphically explained his spiritual condition by saying, "Your Reverence, I'll manage for the faith, but it's the morals that bates me." Remarks are freely made, both publicly and privately, as to the want of sobriety, of truthfulness, of honest and of upright dealing, of trustworthiness, of respectable and orderly conduct amongst our people. They are spoken of as being not the best but the worst members of the community; the most disorderly, the most drunken, the most violent, the most criminal. We who know them better, and are acquainted with their circumstances and difficulties, and their virtues as well as their faults, know how much these charges against them are exaggerated by national prejudice; how much of their real faults comes from causes that ought in fairness to be taken into account. But it is of no use to shut our eyes to the amount of truth that there is in the charge. That it is to a certain extent true, however it may be accounted for or palliated, is one great difficulty of our position. Moreover, if drunken or disorderly habits were confined to the men, the mischief would be comparatively small; but it extends to the women. The wives of the labouring men, the mothers of our school children, are too often no better. What is this but to say that the homes of the children are bad? Here is the root of all our difficulties. The providence of God has ordained the family as the unit out of the aggregate of which society is made up. The natural affection of the parents provides for the protection and well-being of a number of children not too great to be individually known and cared for. Wherever the family home is orderly and well-conducted the young ones can be reared happily and healthfully. But where the nest itself is defiled, how can the brood be expected to thrive?

Now, the poorer classes are at all times exposed to many difficulties in keeping a well-ordered house, from which the wealthier classes are free. Things may be managed so long as the father and mother continue young, healthy, and in full work. But sickness brings extra expense, while it cuts off the supplies. This, or the want of work, involves them in debt, from which it often takes some time to get free. If the wife is sick, the order of the home is at once upset. There is no one to cook the food or clean the house, or to see to the children but herself, or any of the children who may be old enough to be useful. The doctor cannot be sent for *ad libitum*, as a single visit would swallow up the day's pay. If an order is to be got from the parish, the husband must often sacrifice hours of work in waiting about to obtain it. Obsequious tradespeople do not call at the house for orders; somebody must go for the bread, the grocery, and the meat or

vegetables. If husband or wife are sent for by a pastor, magistrate or master; they must often wait about and be put off to another time, and as there is nobody to take their place at home or at work while they are absent, the work is not done, the home is not attended to. If we will only consider how we should get on if we had to earn everything and to do everything for ourselves, instead of being helped and waited on by others, it may enable us to realize the strain of constant exertion which it must be to keep an orderly, well-conducted home amidst such a variety of interrupting incidents and accidents. A labouring man may be blessed with a helpmate who is shrewd, thrifty, and energetic, and so may get on better than his neighbours. But most men's wives are not thrifty and energetic. Moreover, were they ever so stirring, and ever so clever and managing, they do not stay at home, but leave the house all day for work, and coming home evening after evening, worn and weary, they have neither time nor heart to set the house in order nor to look to the children. They soon lose interest in attempting what cannot succeed in their absence, and acquiesce in the disorder and dirt of the home, and even in the irregularities and sufferings of their uncared-for children.

Thus the children whom we have to educate are exposed to great dangers out of doors and sometimes to still greater dangers at home; for their homes are commonly no safeguard against vice, and are often the very places where they learn it. Now, what is it that we are proposing that our schools should undertake? No thing less than to counteract the evil of bad homes, as well as of outdoor dangers to faith, to which the children are exposed, and bring them up to be better fathers and mothers, and more Christian members of society than their parents. Certainly this is expecting the schools to do a great deal. It may be that some of us are not sanguine of success; but this, it seems, and nothing less than this, is the work that has to be done, and we have got no other means or machinery for doing it—if it is done at all—than through the school. We have then a far more serious competition than competing with the Board schools in secular instruction. We have to compete with the attractive influences of the world's sophisms and seductions on the minds of the children, and so to enlighten and influence them by the realities of natural and revealed truth as that they shall not be carried away by them. We have to teach them pure, soft, and gentle ways, to give them a taste and love for what is fair and upright and truthful, and kind in dealing with others. We have to teach them a standard of virtue and morality by which to measure their conduct and direct their life. And, whereas teaching the theory of virtue and religion is by itself of little

efficacy, we have, what is more difficult, to enforce the theory by sanction and example and to train the children in the practice of their duties in the ordinary avocations of daily life.

If all this is to be attempted in our schools, this much is plain, that they have got something far more arduous and difficult to do than competing with others in secular instruction. To say that we must attend to the secular part or we could not keep the school in existence is true, but not to the point. For the question is—what object we propose to ourselves in keeping the school in existence. Is it the secular instruction, or the Christian education of the children? One of these two must be consciously or unconsciously the primary and ruling object. If the chief end in view were the secular instruction, we should scarcely be at so much trouble, and often considerable sacrifice, to do what we feel can be done as well, or better, by others. But it is not the secular instruction but the Christian education which is our main object, to which the secular part, highly important as it is, must be subordinate. Well then, to sacrifice this great and primary object, and let it take only a secondary place in the work, because without secular instruction we could not get the children or maintain the school, is *propter vitam perdere causas vivendi*. It is not only a crime, but a blunder.

2. We do not mean to do this, and yet it often is done. How comes it? Is it that our schools cannot, while accepting Government aid, be at the same time places of Christian education? Is there a radical and inherent incompatibility in the two things? Are the regulations under which inspected schools must go on, and the conditions for obtaining grants, absolutely inconsistent with the school being practically a Christian school? Or is it a matter that is in any way in our own hands, so that by pains and exertion it may be done, though not, perhaps, without difficulty? We propose to say something on each of these suppositions.

Is it then really impossible, as some contend, that our schools, while accepting Government grants and inspection, should continue to be Christian schools? The question is not as to whether a condition of things that gave us unlimited command of means, and yet left us free to do what we liked in all matters of secular as well as of religious instruction, might not be preferable. But is it practically impossible, whilst things remain as they are? It is for those who affirm that it is so to say in what the impossibility consists. For ourselves, after a long and close experience of schools, though we are quite aware of there being difficulties, of which we will speak later on, yet we have never been able to see any difficulties that were insurmountable. And we say further,

not only are the difficulties surmountable, but they are often, in fact, surmounted. And this we are prepared to prove. We will show the incredulous schools of all kinds—small schools, large schools, country schools, town schools, schools among well-to-do populations, and schools amongst the most impoverished and needy, girls' schools, infants' schools, and some, though not so many, boys' schools, schools under religious, and schools under secular teachers, in which the thing is done—Government inspection submitted to, and all regulations complied with necessary to receiving Government aid, and while Government grants are, in fact, earned year after year, the religious instruction and discipline are nevertheless satisfactorily and successfully attended to. *Solvitur ambulando*. However cogent may be the arguments showing that it cannot be done, in matter of fact it is done. We have seen it ourselves, and can show it to others.

But while we quite disbelieve in the existence of anything that renders it impossible to give a Christian education in Government-aided schools, it will be well to take some notice of the alleged impossibilities; for letters and Articles have been written, and assertions made, as if the thing were at least practically and morally impossible. The allegations made are such as these:—That the Government makes the regulations of the schools, and by its inspectors enforces the observance of these regulations, and shapes their character to its own (nefarious) purposes. That its inspectors can visit the school at any time, with or without notice, and can control the teachers and practically take the school out of the Manager's hands. Meantime, the Manager's visits and interference are restricted to certain hours and particular matters, so that the school is, in fact, a Government and not a Catholic institution; and that we must submit to this, since without the grants we could not maintain the school at all, but must shut it up. Another special grievance, rendering the religious instruction impossible, is the restriction of the time in which it can be given to some time outside the school hours. Except at this fixed time, which must be approved of by the inspector, neither the Priest, nor (*infandum et terribile dictu*), even the Bishop, can instruct the children in their religion. Their interference, it is boldly said, is restricted to two days in the year. Moreover we must receive any children who offer themselves. We are not allowed to refuse admission to any one, while, on the other hand, children who object to religious instruction can absent themselves, and thus a special premium is offered to neglect of religious instruction; while it is provided that no child must be allowed to suffer from non-attendance at any religious observance. We cannot use Catholic books nor

Catholic emblems, nor even our own devotions, except at stated times.

In these and similar assertions there is some truth, or they would not deceive so many persons as they do; but the truth is distorted or exaggerated. If we take the pains to sift the assertions, we think that those that remain true leave some difficulty indeed, in keeping up the schools as places of Christian education, but do not in any sense render it impracticable. If those who mistrust and abhor the "Government system" will patiently study what we *can* do in our schools, with some of the pains that they have bestowed in learning what we cannot do, they will learn that the true state of things is not so bad in reality as they have been led to imagine.

We do not undertake the defence of the Education Act, or the regulations of the New Code, but we have no need to be unjust or inaccurate in what we say of them. It does not strengthen but weaken a cause to support it on entirely baseless reasons, or such as have no substantial foundation. Now, it is not true that a Catholic Elementary School cannot receive Government grants if it has religious emblems in it. There is no restriction of the kind. Nor is it true that there is any restriction put on the visits of the Priest, who may bring with him the Bishop or even a private friend. If the Priest be, as he mostly is, a Manager of the school, it is a part of his duty to visit the school, not only during the hours of religious, but of secular instruction. It is not true that "the Government" makes the regulations of the school; nor that the Government Inspector enforces them. If the latter practically controls the school, he can only do so in those cases in which the Managers have abdicated their office, with which the Inspectors are expressly forbidden to interfere. Such statements could not be made by persons who had much experience in managing schools under inspection. Other statements have some truth in them, but are completely misleading, because they lay down as universally true that which is only partially so and under certain circumstances. Thus, when it is said that no child can be refused admission, that is true in this restricted sense; that if there is room in the school, and the child's parents are ready to comply with the regulations of the school as regards punctuality, payment, cleanliness, and the rest, we cannot refuse secular instruction to such a child on account of its religion. It is absolutely incorrect and misleading to say that children can absent themselves from religious instruction. There is only this grain of truth in the assertion, that the parents—not the children—can claim, not that they should be absent from the school, but that they should not be instructed in the tenets of a religion in which they do not conscientiously believe; that is, they must be

taken aside during the hour of religious instruction and be instructed in something else. It is only in the same sense true that Catholic books cannot be used in our schools. They can be used; but not so as to inculcate Catholic doctrines during the hours of secular instruction, and on children whose parents might not be Catholics. The time-table, it is true, and the hour or hours fixed by it for religious instruction, must be approved of by the inspector. This certainly is *male sonans* in Catholic ears. It is surely an interference with religious liberty. Well, whatever we think of it, only let us in fairness add that her Majesty's Inspector is *bound* by the regulations of the Education Department to keep to his own business in this matter, and to approve of any time-table which shows that the time for secular instruction is not interfered with. We may, indeed, fairly enough dislike some of the existing regulations of the Code and wish them altered. They were not made for the special benefit of Catholics, nor under our advice. But that we may not be unreasonable about them we should not forget the nature of the relationship between the Government and our, or any other denominational, schools. We are left free to apply or not, as we like, for Government aid; but if we do so the Government informs us that it no longer makes grants for religious instruction, but for secular instruction only. To give the public money for that instruction it claims to see that a certain fixed amount of the school time is each day allotted to it by the regulations of the school, and it stipulates that its officers may have free access to the schools to see that these regulations are not a dead letter, but that the children are in fact present day by day for the required time, and receive instruction in secular subjects from competent teachers. Further it stipulates that it shall be able to examine into the result of such teaching, and pay, in part, according to their success. Some of the regulations most objected to have for their aim simply to guard the secular instruction from encroachment in any way. We may prefer that there were other arrangements. But it does not seem unreasonable in principle that the Government, in offering grants of public money to elementary schools for secular instruction, should both make conditions and take measures to insure their getting the article in full for which they pay. Nor is this in itself any unfair encroachment on our liberty. With all our difficulties our situation in this country is so much better off than elsewhere that there is scarcely any nation in Europe in which Catholics would not gladly exchange with us.

All the inhabitants of this country, whether native or foreign [says Professor Mivart, in a public protest made by him and many other men of note against the proposed Education Laws in France], are free to open a school at their own expense, and teach, and may

associate together to teach, at their will and pleasure, provided they do not offend against public morals in the ordinary sense of that term.

All Englishmen have the right of educating their children in schools of their own choice, and of supporting and making use of strictly denominational schools, taught by their own freely-chosen teachers.

Englishmen would think the abolition of this freedom an intolerable hardship. So scrupulous is the English Government in this respect, that it not only abstains from interference with voluntary schools, but even makes to such voluntary schools as will submit to public inspection large grants, while allowing them full religious freedom. Thus any, even small religious body, which has schools of its own, inspected by Government, remains free to appoint or remove teachers, and to choose the books to be used for religious instruction. Each such body also remains free to train its own masters and mistresses in its own training schools, while State aid is granted (in proportion to the result achieved) which may amount to half the total cost.

We have, then, to ask again what is there in the position of Government-aided schools which renders it *impossible* for them to be in the highest sense places of Christian education? For them to effect this great object it is indeed essential that they should have good conscientious teachers, for such as the teacher is, so is the school. The tone and spirit of a school, so far as it is under control at all, is controlled by the teacher. Well, we can appoint what teachers we like. They must indeed be certificated, but thanks to our Training schools there is a good supply of certificated teachers from which to select. Government at least does not interfere. The regulations of the school, which do much to support the teacher if they are good, or to hamper and hinder him if they are bad, these again are under our own control. The rules for admission and expulsion, for reward and punishment, the hours and subjects of religious instruction, the arrangement of the schoolroom and playground, the selection of monitors and pupil teachers and of books, and all the innumerable details of personal interference and influence—they are all in the Manager's hands, so far as he chooses to take them up. They are his province and duty, though in default of his knowing his business, or fulfilling his duty, they will no doubt fall into other hands.

No, it is said, the Manager cannot make what regulations he likes. He must not touch the secular instruction, nor can he choose what time he likes for the most important of all subjects, religious instruction. What do men mean by speaking thus? Do they mean to complain of it as a hardship, that they should give a fixed, regular time to the subjects of secular instruction? Why "school children have," as Bishop Hedley reminds us, "to learn to read, to sum, and to write, and the strongest denomina-

tionalists would not think of teaching nothing but religion." Is it that too much time is given to these subjects? No, that cannot be; for "the Government system" has not increased the time given to them; quite as much was given before and is given now in schools that are not under Government. The Government has only agreed to pay for this time if it is honestly given; if we object to giving so much we need not do so, but if we agree to be paid for the hours of secular instruction, we cannot reasonably complain of having to fulfil our side of the compact.

But it leaves no time for religious instruction, which can only be given before or after the hours of secular instruction.* Doubtless this is an inconvenience, and sometimes creates a difficulty. But does it—for that is the present question—make it practically impossible to give adequate religious instruction. It would be strange if it did so. For before any such condition was made, and when as yet we were quite free to take what time, and when we liked, for religious instruction, it was very common not to take more than an hour for it, and to take it at the same time as it is now taken in inspected schools. Moreover, we have come to know that the same arrangement is constantly now made in schools that are untrammelled by the conditions of inspected schools. Now, if this were really a practical obstacle to our giving that amount of religious instruction which we desired, we should find that those who were not fettered by such a difficulty would make use of their freedom, and that even those who were fettered would at least go to the full length that their chain allowed. Yet such does not appear to be the case.

Let us go into details, as there may be some who are interested in the subject and who may not have had any opportunity of knowing its practical working. The time that is ordinarily given to school work in elementary schools is five hours, and the most common arrangement is to take three of these hours in the forenoon—say from nine to twelve,—and two in the afternoon from 2 to 4 p.m. But while this represents the hours the school keeps, it does not necessarily represent the hours kept by the scholars. For while some schools oblige their scholars to be present all the time, excluding such as come late, others keep the doors open, and admit late comers. This depends on the Managers, who can make and enforce what rule they think best. The Education Department recognizes the exercise of their discretion in the matter, for whereas the ordinary school attendance must be two hours long, in order to count towards obtaining a grant, yet the Code says that when the "necessary attendance" is three hours long—when, that is to say, the school regulations require such an at-

* A slight modification has lately been made in this rule where there is a class-room attached to the school.

tendance, a quarter of an hour may be taken out of the hours of secular instruction for the purposes of recreation. Thus, the following time-tables will meet all the requirements of the Education Department :—

9	A.M.	School opens. Rolls called.
$9\frac{1}{4}$	„	Religious instruction.
$10\frac{1}{4}$	„	Secular instruction begins.
11	„	Recreation for a quarter of an hour.
$12\frac{1}{4}$	„	Morning attendance closes.

Or this :

9	A.M.	Rolls called.
$9\frac{1}{4}$	„	Secular instruction begins.
11	„	Recreation.
$11\frac{1}{4}$	„	Religious instruction till
12 or $12\frac{1}{4}$.		

Thus without giving any time to religious instruction in the afternoon a full hour may be secured either before or after the secular instruction in the morning. If no recreation is given, or if only three-quarters of an hour are given to religious instruction, the school attendance need not be more than three hours long, instead of three hours and a quarter as in the above instance.

By these and by other arrangements a good and adequate time may be secured for religious instruction. What, then, is meant when it is said that Government regulations do not leave time for the purpose? The explanation lies here, that the time-tables given above presuppose the exclusion of late comers. Now if late comers are admitted they both miss a part of their day's work and naturally disturb and interrupt both the teachers and their classes in the work that is going on; and this disadvantage must fall either on the religious or the secular instruction. If on the secular, it has a tendency to diminish the Grant, as the late comers do not make their full time, and their attendances will not count; moreover the subject that is taught under disadvantage is not properly known at the examination. If the disadvantage falls on religious instruction, then the Grant indeed is preserved in its completeness, but the religious instruction is not properly known. Then why not exclude late comers? That too might lessen the Grant, as, if the late comers can be got in time for the secular instruction, they will count towards augmenting the Grant, and the Grant is undeniably an important thing in the case of our schools. Besides, there are other objections made to excluding late comers. However, this is what is meant when it is said that Government-aided schools have no time to attend fully to religious instruction. That there are difficulties we do not deny, and we have something to say about them

later on. But we think we have shown that there is no impossibility. It is not Government regulations that prevent us from excluding late comers, or that make the difficulty and disadvantage consequent on their admission to fall on the religious rather than on the secular instruction. Then, Christian education does not depend entirely on the instruction, but still more on the example and influence of the teachers, the tone and spirit of the schools, and also on the training of the pupils in the habits and ways of virtue and religion. All this we have in our own hands, and entirely untouched by any interference on the part of Government, except that the Grant is slightly augmented if the school is favourably reported on as to discipline; but even as regards religious instruction the interference only amounts to this, that it must not be given during the stipulated time of secular instruction, for which, and for which alone, the Department agrees to pay. Can it be said with truth that this is a bar to the subject being efficiently taught? Well, there are not a few schools that do not find it so.

3. And this brings us to our third question: Shall we succeed in overcoming the difficulties? For a thing may not be so impossible but that some are found who, by special effort, achieve it; yet the difficulty of doing this may be so great as to be a strain and burthen which it is not in human nature to continue to bear. Is this the case as regards maintaining our schools as places of Christian education? Undoubtedly the difficulties are considerable—difficulties arising first from our having to do more than others in providing funds. This is very often hard work. We have frequently seen and admired the personal sacrifices which Catholic Managers—the very men who sometimes know little about school management—are making to build or to maintain schools, sacrifices unobtrusively made, but really very grand. Then we have very serious difficulties in the secular spirit; not seldom found in teachers, sometimes—let us say it out—in ourselves too,—the desire to cut a figure before others by distinguished success at Government examinations; priding ourselves on taking high places in all sorts of extra and unnecessary subjects, to bring out the fact that we can really do as well as others, though we are Catholics. Well of course we can, and it may be right that we should aim at distinction; but the want of sobriety on the subject which shows itself in some of us being *slightly* off our heads when a Catholic pupil-teacher or Queen's scholar takes a first place, all this is, we think, a real difficulty. There are difficulties of great magnitude in the fact, even if it is an unavoidable one, of the Managers of our schools not being selected for their interest or experience in their work, or being in any way trained or prepared for it. It is not always an easy post to fill. It

often calls for the exercise of patience, tact, forbearance, and prudence, as well as of energy and determination. The clergy are not ordinarily aided by others to any great extent in the fulfilment of its duties. They are sometimes afraid of interference, and make those stand off who might give them material assistance. Thus the burthen hangs mostly on one man, who may be an invalid, or pre-occupied with other matters, or heavily engaged in more pressing work, or young and inexperienced, and subject to be changed to another place. But when, in addition to this, it is remembered that he is set over teachers who *are* trained and often skilled in their profession, it can easily be seen that the teacher is likely to have it all his own way, or that if the Manager interferes, he may do so for evil and not for good. The Bishop of Birmingham complained some years ago that "Schoolmasters were already beginning to fancy themselves wiser in their sphere than clergymen." The difficulty here referred to will not be diminished, but augmented, if they really are wiser in their sphere. And it cannot be got over by lessening the professional wisdom of the schoolmaster, but only by increasing that of the Manager. How is this to be done? It is a real difficulty. Then we have another special difficulty of our own in the class of children we have principally to deal with, who are not the children of those who live in regular and orderly homes. Partly through their poverty, partly through their having to go about from place to place for work, and so living an unsettled life, partly from the unthrifty ways they have inherited from the hopeless condition in which they were left in Ireland, so it is that the homes of our working people from Ireland are not on an equality with those of the rest of their class.

The Bishop of Birmingham has a passage on this subject:—

Terribly in want of a home are our poor dear Catholic Irish. They swarm through the population seeking work. Strangers and wanderers, they take lodging in the foulest quarters of a town, because they are the cheapest and the only quarters which will receive them. The damp and mouldy chamber, which is the abode and sleeping-place of the family, has, perhaps, not even an occasional lime-wash to refresh its walls; and he who has two or three broken-down chairs and a pallet for the family to lie on, has a comparatively well-furnished lodging. Of what interest is it to him? he must leave it next week. And this is his life and the life of his children. In Birmingham it is estimated that one in three, in Wolverhampton that one in four, of the Catholic poor, change their place of living within a few months.—Notes, p. 53.

These are some of the special circumstances which render the work of educating our Catholic children, not indeed impossible, but exceedingly difficult.

Shall we succeed in it?

If we have called attention to the magnitude of the work, and of our own special difficulties in accomplishing it, this has not been with the view of discouraging the attempt. But it is no good policy to despise your enemy, or to suppose that ordinary exertion—doing a little quiet easy work—will enable us to succeed in a task of extraordinary difficulty. We can succeed: but we can do so only by fairly estimating what we have to do, and applying judgment in the plan of our work, and sustained vigour in its execution. With anything less than this we must be beaten. We believe, then, that we are doing a good work in endeavouring to awaken attention to the difficulties as well as the greatness of the task, that they may not be underrated. We will endeavour to draw attention to points of some strategical value, as we think, in achieving a victory.

1. And first as regards ourselves, who have the control over the teachers and the schools. If our greatest difficulty is in ourselves, yet fortunately it is also most in our own power. The General who has to conduct a difficult enterprise looks first to his own men, their spirit and discipline and knowledge of their profession. Unless he can rely on them, no wise policy or prudent foresight or admirable arrangement will avail. The condition of our schools depends on the character of the Managers and the efficiency of the teachers; but more on the former than on the latter, for if the teacher is inefficient, a wise Manager will either improve or dismiss such a teacher. But a teacher cannot do so much with his Manager. It is a fact, clear and undisputed, that Managers up to their work, and interested in it, always make good schools. It is less clear, but quite as certain, that careless, unskilled Managers make bad schools. What can we do then to increase the number of Managers with knowledge and skill in their work? The want is a crying one. It is not pleasant to complain of men who are often working hard, and sometimes making personal sacrifices for their schools—who are so often kind and indulgent, and whose fault it is not that they are young and inexperienced, or that they know nothing of a business that they have never been taught. Yet those whose business is about schools and pupil teachers and training colleges, and who see the inside reality as well as the outside show of things, know well enough that this is the principal cause of most that is amiss; and a very real and a very great evil it is, though less felt no doubt in the case of large and populous missions, where the younger Managers learn their work from the others. Could not that which is the occasional cause of abating the evil be turned into a means of further improvement? There is no learning the practical management of schools by mere theory. Men must be in the work and personally acquainted

with its details, to enter into its difficulties and see the way out of them. If only they could begin their career by an apprenticeship under a master-hand whose schools were an example of the best methods and management, and from whose example they might learn the proper relationship of Manager to teacher, and of teacher to Manager, how many of the evils under which schools now suffer would disappear! Men of exceptional good sense and prudence and energy, are indeed now and then able to make up for the want of such an apprenticeship; but most men are not exceptional; and while they are learning by the experience of difficulties, troubles, mishaps, and sometimes miseries, the school goes on in an uncertain, unsatisfactory, unbusinesslike way, that creates want of confidence in the minds of the parents, and ruins half a generation of the poor children, who have thus lost their one chance of turning out better members of the Church and of society. We must somehow provide that our Managers should understand their position and their work. It will not do that men should fill so responsible a post with a mere chance that they will in time learn its duties and come to be fit for them. So much rests with the Managers, on their power of controlling the teachers, of influencing the children, and of working on the parents, that it is indispensable that we should somehow have them educated up to the important position in which they will be practically, for good or evil, irresponsible.*

2. The difficulties and responsibilities of the Manager's position have indeed been felt to be so heavy that some have thought to escape from them by putting their schools under the care of Religious. But the difficulty cannot by this means be adequately met. For the great bulk of schools throughout the country cannot be provided for in this way. Nor, as regards smaller schools, and schools in country places, have the attempts to do it been altogether successful. Many who have made the experiment, have complained that the Sisters, though very good Religious, yet not belonging to an Educational Order, were not successful teachers. Even if the order or congregation is one devoted to education, and

* The *Rambler* for November, 1856, in an article on "Our Poor Schools," adverted to this difficulty. "Why should not this, so important a part of what a priest has to do, be taught him as part of his necessary training, before he enters upon his missionary work? If there are not sufficient opportunities at college for want of poor schools large enough to serve as models, yet there are in London and our large towns multitudes of poor children who would be only too grateful for the care and instruction of newly ordained priests; who, while they visited the schools day after day, would soon come to learn how they might most efficiently be carried on. And as they were removed to more responsible spheres of duty, they would carry away with them the idea of what a school ought to be, and by what means such an idea might best be realized."

has a supply of prepared teachers, yet the smaller places are apt to be supplied with the less efficient teachers, the stronger ones being required for more important schools. However, if our schools could all be provided with efficient Religious teachers—which they cannot—we maintain that the Managers would not thereby get rid of their responsibility. For the Religious teachers, even though they may be left more to themselves in the conscientious and devoted discharge of their duty, and so may require less supervision, yet in other ways want more support and assistance than secular teachers. It must be remembered that they, more than secular teachers, are limited to doing the work that comes to them. They cannot easily look after that which does not come. And, what is far more important, it is sometimes, though not always the case, that Religious teachers are somewhat confined in views, and hampered in action by usages and traditions of school-work, which, being derived from other countries and other times, are not always suitable to our present condition. The good sense of the teachers and their superiors would no doubt regulate things so as to meet present exigencies, if they saw the effects of their methods and ways of discipline out of doors. But they do not see it. They see, indeed, that part which is successful, but not much more. The good and devout return to them from time to time, the rest are out of sight. But the Managers live out of doors, and can see all. They have opportunities for watching the effect of systems in the long run. Men of large experience in mission work will sometimes say that they do not find the children brought up in these schools turn out such as might be expected from the care that has been bestowed on them by the Religious. The reason is not far to seek. The Religious have not any practical knowledge of the sort of life the children have to live when they leave school, and the school life of the children is often not a suitable preparation for such a life. So that when schools are under Religious they still require Managers, both to aid and support their efforts in dealing with the children and with the parents, who are out of the teachers' reach, and also, sometimes, to let in a little external light by which the teachers may see the effect of their work in the long run, how far it fulfils the object to be attained, and may take care that the teaching and discipline of the school is not of any fancy pattern, but such as will stand the wear and tear and rough usage of actual life.

The fact is, that the very piety of Religious sometimes leads them to train the children in a way that is unsuitable to their future life in the world. The Sisters are never so well pleased as when they can make the children pious and devout like themselves, and are apt to stimulate them to fervour by all sorts of

little excitements. These have great effect on the fervid imagination of youth, and do produce great present results. Under their influence the children become very good, and sometimes the good is of a lasting character. But we have had opportunities of hearing more than once the opinions of experienced Managers as to the general effect of this system. They are pretty well of one mind that its ordinary effect is temporary and superficial. Indeed, it cannot but be dangerous, for it inseparably connects in the children's minds and in their habits, religious duty and devotions, and makes the former to depend on the latter. This is all very well so long as the children continue under the Sisters' care, and in their happy life at school. But before long they are taken away and are put to work, in service or in the mill. At once many of their little external devotions are out of reach, and if, as too often happens, they have not a substratum of solid religious principle and sense of duty, and habits of self-denial, to fall back upon, the whole edifice collapses. Because they have no longer the support of religious excitement they now give up, not only their little devotions, but the weightier matters of God's law. With the cooling of their devotion they grow lax in religious duties. Next they become negligent, and only too often give them up entirely, looking back on their former state as on a bright, happy dream, but only a dream, which has passed away, now that they have been awakened to the trying realities of actual life. We have often heard painful observations on the unsatisfactory way in which Convent school children turn out, and have known men of experience to say that they would not have their schools under Religious. But surely this is misreading things. To have our children under the care of those who are, with scarcely an exception, conscientious and pious, is so far a clear advantage. Their habits of self-control, of obedience, of patience, of submission to authority, are a grand example to the children, as well as being a huge power of influence over them. That all this good should be so often without lasting fruit is a great misfortune, but not one that essentially belongs to Convent schools. It is consequent on the narrow and secluded life of Religious, through which they miss seeing that there are circumstances and conditions outside in the world which must be taken into account and provided for if they are to do a lasting good. They do not seem fully to understand what is going on in actual life, nor the practical effect of their system in the long run. How should they? But this shows that it is a delusion to fancy that we can hand over our Schools to Religious, and wash our hands of the responsibility. For the Manager to fly from the anxiety and trouble of management, and leave them to the care

of Religious, is not indeed a leap from the frying-pan into the fire, but it is a leap from the fire into the frying-pan, where he will again meet the same enemies under a somewhat different form, but in a more contracted space. No; the Manager cannot in this way abdicate his office. His duty is to support the Religious in their devoted work, but also determinately to guard them against dangers and mischief which they do not see, but which he does.

3. While, however, it is not always possible to make others see things in our light, or work in our way, yet the actual regulations of the school are absolutely in the hands of the Manager; and if he has a difficulty here, it is not in fighting against others, but in fighting against himself. To revert to a point already referred to, we have seen that the attendance of children at our schools, rather than at Board schools, depends on the religious principles and conscientiousness of the parents who have to make some sacrifice, as they think, of worldly advantages for the sake of the spiritual good of their children. We do not hesitate to call on them for that sacrifice, and expect them to make it. Now the Managers of our schools are themselves in a similar position in being called upon to sacrifice a certain amount of temporal advantage for a spiritual good. How can we call on others to make a sacrifice which we are unwilling to make ourselves? Yet this is what it comes to. The case is this. The united Episcopate have been for many years engaged in securing adequate religious instruction in our elementary schools. This is ground they have been tenaciously endeavouring to maintain. The Poor School Committee was instituted as a means of helping to secure this important object. At length, after many changes and contests, we find ourselves landed in a position in which we can still get hold of the one thing we have been fighting for, and, as far as appears, can keep it, but only with considerable trouble and sacrifice. Still, if we take this trouble and make this sacrifice, we can keep it. There are those around us who are doing it. There is nothing to prevent the securing for all our children at school a sufficient amount of time for religious instruction. Yet it would seem that in a great many cases this is not done.* And the reason why it is not done is, that teachers and Managers are unwilling to make any arrangement for it by which they run a risk of losing any portion of the Government grant. Now religious instruction is not indeed the only element of Catholic

* As an example of this, here is a passage from a Diocesan Report: "There are still a certain number of schools in which the principal time appointed for religious instruction is that during which the children are assembling—and this, of course, is the worst time in the day for any purpose whatever. It is quite obvious that no instruction can be efficiently

education, but it is a very important element of it. To know the truth of Faith thoroughly is at once one of the chiefest supports of the soul, and one of the greatest safeguards against the attacks and temptations of disbelief. To know the laws of God in their practical application to daily life both strengthens the dictates of conscience and guides it amid the sophisms that would mislead and ensnare it. How can thorough, accurate, and earnest instruction be given to the different classes of children unless there is an adequate and suitable time allotted to it? Should it not hold the first and best, instead of the last place in the subjects of the day's work? But if a time is given to it when the children are not or may not all be present, or when there is a difficulty in giving full and undistracted attention, the greatest of all subjects is subjected to special disadvantages, and the children know this, and thus they are really learning at school the same bad lesson that the world is teaching them out of doors, that religion is not the most important thing to attend to. In all our knowledge and experience of our schools there is nothing that seems to us so sad and so strange as that Managers should not do what they can in a difficult and dangerous position to insure religious instruction having fair play. If a sacrifice must be made, though we do not think it really involves one, we must make it. For it is quite clear that if we do not maintain religious instruction in our schools, nobody else will do so.

4. Religious instruction, fully, accurately, carefully given is indeed indispensable for our success, yet unless it is accompanied with some sort of training it will effect little. After the Commandments were given on Mount Sinai the people were not left to lay them to heart, and keep them or not as they pleased. The first offenders against each Commandment were visited with severe punishment, and thus its practical character was brought home to them. The same sort of thing must be done in school if the children are to be practically influenced by the religious instruction. They must see that the instruction is a reality, by its being acted up to in school life. They must feel that they themselves have to act up to it. It is not what the child is told that makes an impression on it, but what it feels that itself and others have to do. The spectacle of the teacher enforcing in

given while many of the children have not yet arrived, and those who are present are distracted by the constant arrival and movement of others. In cases, therefore, where this arrangement is adopted, and the examination shows unsatisfactory results, I cannot but feel that the fault is not entirely on the part of the children."

Yet so little are these matters understood amongst us, that in 1870, when the Education Act had just passed, the Poor School Committee's Report appeared with a positive suggestion to arrange the time-table in our schools in this very way.

daily practice the lessons he inculcates, has a powerful effect on the child. The example the schoolmaster himself sets is still more effective. This is what we understand by the discipline of a school. Not merely the order and drill, nor the system of enforcing strict obedience by punishments only, but the whole influence of the school in forming the character—by example, by reward, by correction, by gentle reproof and reasoning. The child is led astray at home and in the streets by the force of example, and the inducements of pleasure. No mere words will counteract this force. It can only be counteracted by examples and inducements of equal or greater weight in the opposite direction. Unless the tone and spirit of the school is good, and unless its influence is a strong one, the child will not be led into a love and practice of virtue.*

We have ventured to say thus much on school discipline, because though obvious enough, yet it is a matter that is not sufficiently attended to in our schools. We do not wish to judge rashly, but will put it as a question for the consideration of school Managers, whether our school teachers are not more occupied in mind and engaged in fact, in teaching “the three R’s,” and preparing to pass the Government standards as the great end of school work, than they are in forming the character of the poor children and influencing their hearts and lives. The three R’s must of course occupy more school time than direct religious instruction, but that has nothing to do with the question as to which really holds the leading place in the life and aim of the school. We cannot serve two masters here any more than in other matters. One must come in a short time to be subordinate and secondary to the other. The author of a pamphlet entitled “*Secularism in Elementary Education*” argued that in Government-aided schools the secular spirit and aim must predominate. If so, the battle is lost; but we do not believe it to be impossible, but only difficult, to make our schools, as many now are, places of Christian instruction and discipline, although the children continue to pass Government standards of secular knowledge, and to earn Government grants.

We go further than this. We venture to maintain that it is by our schools being places of Christian instruction and discipline that we shall win. We are involved in a competition with others in the matter of education. To succeed we must be able to produce a better article than they do. In mere secular instruction we can be beaten by more powerful machinery than we can command. But the School Board machinery has not as yet

* For more on this subject we may venture to refer to “*The School Manager.*” Burns and Oates.

turned out the precise article that is wanted. The English people do not want to have their children brought up without religion. They have still at heart a respect and love for Christian belief and Christian conduct. The most advanced secularists are a little scared at the sort of youth which their system turns out. Though intelligent and well-informed, he is not on the whole a nice creature. They might endure his not reverencing God; but that he should not regard man is unpleasant. He is independent, bumptious, and rough. He lets you know that he considers "one man as good as another," and he might add, like the Irishman, "and a deal better," without danger of being misunderstood. Not only some School Boards are seeking how they may exert moral influence over their children, but the Education Department actually pays extra for good discipline. The educational public are feeling about for some system that will turn out scholars, who, while up to the mark in intelligence and information, are also well disciplined and conscientious. They want to raise a breed of young people that is clean, smart, and clever, but one that can also be depended on to be upright, honest, and truthful, and with some regard to the wants and feelings of others; and if these points are attained they do not object to the existence of religious principle and conviction. Now here we can beat the Board Schools. We can produce a better article in this line than they can. Small schools, or at least of such moderate size that all the children can be individually known and cared for—schools conducted by persons of strong religious convictions, and for the sake of those convictions, are favourably circumstanced for turning out what is wanted, and what will be valued also, as soon as it comes to be known. Only not let us not be so unwise in our generation as to come down from our elevated position and our high and holy work of giving Christian education, to compete in the common arena of mere secular instruction. We need not give up this latter; we do not need to do so; but we do need to keep it in subordination to the higher end of turning out scholars who have learned Christian faith and Christian discipline. *In hoc signo vinces.*

5. The execution of this mainly depends on our Managers. They have almost absolute control over the school. It rests with them to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with school management and school discipline, and then to go cautiously and prudently to work in obtaining good teachers and laying down good regulations. To them it belongs to see to the actual carrying out of their regulations and supporting the exertions of the teacher with both parents and children. Still it is not on Managers alone that we depend for success. We look to those who will support the Managers in their arduous and

anxious work. We think that the Poor School Committee might be of huge service in the present crisis if it would review its past policy and lay its plans for supporting Managers in their special difficulties. The work and expense and responsibility of the school rests on the Managers. Would it not be a wise thing to give help and encouragement to good Managers as well as to other objects? In looking over the list of rewards offered by the Committee, we observe that some are to teachers, some to Queen's scholars, some to pupil teachers, some to candidates, but there is no notice whatever of the Manager, in the fourteen kinds of grants; nothing that is put into his hands, either to lighten the burthen of the school expenses, or for *him* to give as a reward to teachers or children. The Committee deals directly with the successful teacher or scholar, and not with the man on whom the success ultimately depends. Moreover, the majority of the prizes are for success in secular knowledge. Might not the Committee do a great service to the cause of Christian education in our schools, which is the end of its existence, by applying some portion of the funds at its disposal to lessen the excessive inequality that at present exists between the rewards given for secular and for religious proficiency? For this is at once the Manager's temptation and his difficulty. He is ordinarily (though not always) pressed for means to support his school. The school can earn nothing by attention to religious instruction. Everything is for success in secular subjects. The Manager has around him teachers and pupil teachers who can gain great advantages by progress in secular knowledge, next to nothing (in most dioceses) by success in Christian knowledge and training, and that little not through him. It would be of great service just now if some weight could be thrown into the lighter scale. The Committee would be doing a great good if it did something to help those Managers who succeeded in making their schools, and especially boys' schools, places of good religious education. For our greatest difficulty is with boys' schools. We have many girls' schools that are doing good work, but our boys' schools are deficient both in quality and quantity. The Committee has it in its power to abate this evil. If the Manager of a boys' school could look to the Committee for a support grant in proportion to the school's success in religious knowledge, he would be enabled, in some cases, to maintain a boys' school, which now he cannot do for want of funds. In other cases his difficulties and anxieties would be lessened, and in all cases he would have something to put before the master as an incentive to attend carefully to religious instruction. The Committee could not employ more profitably the large sums at its disposal than in acting on the principle and policy of its first chairman, the venerated Charles Langdale,

who always maintained that the duty of the Committee was to look to the present interests of Catholic education, as the present want was urgent, and the future one would be lessened in proportion as our present efforts were successful, while the spectacle of that success would be the best inducement to others to come forward and make donations or bequests. Unless a successful fight can be made just now in maintaining the character of our schools as places of Christian education the Committee is in danger of finding its occupation gone.

6. The Poor School Committee might then, we think, do much to stimulate and encourage the important work of our school Managers. But the training colleges can do still more, for they indirectly help to supply for any weakness in the management. In our present condition, Managers often want something besides mere co-operation. Having no training for their office, they are sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously in the hands of their teachers. Now, thanks to our training colleges, we have a considerable number of mistresses, and some masters, who are full of the spirit of Christian teachers. Where the teacher is one of this sort any ignorance or incompetence on the part of the Manager is of less consequence. It is consoling to think, in the midst of our great difficulties, that either a thoroughly good Manager or a thoroughly good teacher will insure the school being good. For a good Manager will not go on with an indifferent teacher, but will "improve" him either in or out of the school; while a good teacher will not rest satisfied under bad management, but by explanations, suggestions, and remonstrances will obtain leave from the Manager to make all requisite alterations. For teachers, both by their training and their experience, often know the practical working of things far better than the Manager, and we think that it is seldom that they might not succeed in having their way either by the Manager leaving the matter to them, or by his yielding to repeated remonstrances. Now, would it be at all possible for our training colleges to meet the great difficulty of our present condition by sending out teachers who would be efficient and successful as regards Christian education, not only when they enjoyed the advantage of being under good management, but also when they were without that advantage? Trained teachers are sometimes found who do not "go in" for the religious part of their duty, and this not only by practically neglecting it, but by undisguisedly complaining of having to attend to what they think is the work of the clergy, their business being to attend to secular instruction under the Government. Such teachers create unreasonable prejudice against the training colleges, which cannot always discover the dispositions of the students before their admission, nor make them all

they could wish afterwards. They cannot possibly insure every one's turning out well. All they can do is not to recommend unsatisfactory teachers to Managers. There would seem, however, to be not a few teachers who are well up in what they have to do as to the intricacies and difficulties of secular subjects, standards, and examinations, and know how to take full charge of the secular instruction and bring it to a successful issue, but who somehow do not seem to be able to do the same thing as regards the requirements of Christian instruction and discipline. We have known of cases in which they have done it when shown how, and when it has been enforced; but left to themselves they have apparently not understood the arrangement, nor felt the importance, of this department of their work. Would it be possible, we say, for the training schools to do more in preparing them for the emergency of their being left too much to themselves in the matter, and to instruct them how to overcome the difficulties and obstacles to Christian education which are of no uncommon occurrence in school life? Would it be possible that teachers should be better acquainted with the subject of school discipline and have made a study of the different arts, ways, and methods for enforcing the practice and forming habits of a Christian life? Teachers sometimes attend to this out of natural good sense and right feeling, but they do not always seem to have made a study of it, nor to have acquired a love and taste for influencing the children's hearts, and moulding their characters for good. If the training colleges were able—we do not know if they are—to give more of this sort of training, they would have still greater claim on our admiration and gratitude than they have now.

7. We come, at length, to the last and greatest, at once the most essential and the most difficult of all the means towards winning the battle of Christian elementary education, the improvement of the children's homes. As our dangers and difficulties spring from the badness of the homes—we are all agreed on that—so we cannot put things on any permanently satisfactory footing except by the homes being made better. How can it be done? Not certainly by the school managers only; nor can any aid be got here from any public institution. It is one of those things that can only be effected very gradually and by individual effort. We cannot propose any grand and certain remedy; but the case is not on that account hopeless. There is a great deal of devotion and energy amongst us, but these have hitherto run in another, and even an opposite, direction. Immense and noble efforts have been made during the last twenty or thirty years to assist the poorer classes amongst us, but they have taken, for the most part, the shape of assisting only the destitute and miserable. Orphanages have been founded in great numbers, industrial

schools and reformatories have been built and supported, the Little Sisters of the Poor have opened refuges for the aged and broken-down, the Religious of the Good Shepherd for those of abandoned life. There are societies to help the widow and the aged poor, to shelter the homeless, to rescue and take care of infants, to nurse the sick. Charity has come in to take up those who have broken down in any way. But it is a greater help and kindness to people to hold them up and to keep them from breaking down, than to help them when they are down. And in this way we have done very little. Those of our working classes who are careful, industrious, sober, and orderly, have a hard trial in seeing nearly all our attention paid to the least worthy and the most ill-conditioned. It would seem as if there was a premium on idleness, imprudence, and crime, since so much more is done to help the bad than the good. "You visit and assist those people," said one, "and pass us by: yet the difference between us is that they are idle, drunken, and disorderly, and owe their troubles to this; while we keep out of these troubles by great effort and much self-denial." It has been called a *felix culpa* for a Catholic child to misconduct himself, as then he is taken up and sent to some of our excellent institutions.

Now of course, it is just among the miserable, the broken down and the sinner, that Christian charity finds its chiefest objects. We would not say an ungrateful or ungracious word about those who have devoted themselves and their substance in work of this sort. But it is not ungracious to the good works that exist to advocate the claims of a good work that is still wanted. Let us ever continue to lift up those that are down, but let us not therefore omit to hold up the rest that they may not fall. This is the form of Christian charity which we venture to think would be of such great service to us. We want to improve the homes of our poor. Things will never be right till these are in a better state. When the Church was planted in one place after another, the Apostles were from the first earnest in their efforts and exhortations that the converts should lead orderly lives, that they should work, that they should look after their families. Instruction was persistently given to husbands, wives, parents and children, servants and masters, on their respective duties. Those who have studied the history and formation of Christian civilization know what care the Church took to purify the family and set the home in order. And now to say that the Church is in a flourishing condition in any country, is synonymous with saying that the homes of the people are virtuous and well ordered. It must be the same with us if religion is to thrive. But our charities are occupied with the individual, and their good effects mostly stop there. They have little influence in

elevating and upholding the family. If one member of an ill-conducted family is removed from sin or suffering, that one it may be is rescued, but the family still continues in its evil ways. If mothers are relieved of their duties and fathers of their responsibilities, this has no tendency to make them learn to fulfil those duties and responsibilities. Orphans and others who are brought up in institutions may enjoy great advantages in other respects, but the one thing they do *not* learn is the traditional knowledge of a well-ordered home, and the habit of serving God in a bad world, notwithstanding its difficulties and temptations. To provide for those who have left their homes, to relieve those who are thriftless, drunken, and disorderly, or to provide for those who are neglecting their home duties, may be sometimes a good work or even a duty, but there is always a danger in these cases that you should feed the disease as well as the patient. Is it not sometimes a mere weakness to yield to kindly impulses, or a means of escape from present difficulty when we might do a greater and more lasting good in another way? If we cannot give our time and labour and pecuniary support to many things, is it not well to give them in that way which will do most and most lasting good?

But the inquiry is an obvious one, how is it possible to do anything to improve the homes of our people? To support a convent, an orphanage, or a charitable society, is a definite way of doing good. One sees the good that is to be done, and how to help it forward, but how can we control or even interfere with the homes of the poor? A difficult question indeed, and one which cannot be answered in a word. The time was, however, when it was just as difficult to see how to help the different classes of the miserable for whom we are now doing so much. It was not all at once, or by a single effort, that orphanages, asylums, reformatories, industrial schools, night refuges, crèches, and many other charities were formed. It was only after much discussion and combination and repeated efforts, accompanied with difficulties and even failures, that the present great amount of good work was set going to help the unfortunate and criminal classes. Could we only realize and be fully awake to the supreme importance of improving the homes of the labouring classes as the only means of getting to the fountain-head of the crime and misery, we should have already made a great step in advance. For ourselves we should be well satisfied could we but succeed in persuading those, whether clergy or laity, who are zealous for the improvement and spiritual good of our poor, to turn their horses' heads in this direction. Could we get as far as this the work would go on, for though the difficulties are very great, yet charity is ingenious as to ways and means, and we cannot escape

the conviction, that if the zeal, the labour, the patient untiring energy which has been engaged in rescuing the criminal and relieving the unfortunate amongst us, had been directed to the amelioration of the homes, a larger number would have been preserved from sin and misery, than we have now recovered from them.

This is no new idea; more than twenty years back the present Bishop of Birmingham wrote—

What can be done towards inspiring working men with the love of a fixed home? What can be done to keep Irishmen at home, and to induce them to feel the advantages of making their home and their family as comfortable as their means will allow? What can be done to bring about the training of girls for household occupations? And what towards checking the evils of children going at so early an age to work? What, again, towards inducing husbands and sons to cherish their homes, and keep from the public-houses?—*Notes on the Education Question*, p. 70.

As to the means by which any amelioration can be effected, these must vary indefinitely. For they must depend on the circumstances of the locality, the character and habits of the people, and the nature of their work. They must vary again with the circumstances and condition of those who would benefit them, and with the amount of means and influence which they possess. What we desire to advocate is, not the universal application of any one particular nostrum, but that the same sort of effort and influence that are used now in other directions should be used in this direction and with this aim. The clergy have an influence which may effect much. Their words of advice and reproof repeatedly directed to this object, will tell in the long-run. Besides this, they can give public exhortations on this subject, which has ever been one of great importance in the eyes of the Church. They can give or procure lectures and addresses by which, in populous places, a direction may be given to public opinion. If only a taste and fashion for good orderly homes, and an appreciation for the substantial advantage and comfort arising from them, can be excited, the thing would go on apace. But this is not done easily or in a moment. What is more within reach is the personal influence of each one on two or three families. The conferences of S. Vincent of Paul, established first by M. Ozanam in Paris, are in great part for this object. It is a perversion of the conferences when they degenerate into mere relieving societies. Could they work in their pristine vigour and spirit they might do great things in populous localities. There are visiting societies of ladies which would find in this an object worthy of their zeal and energy. But without going to societies and associations, there are amongst us a number of devout and charitable persons ready to employ their time and

moneys in good works, but afraid to attempt this. They are afraid sometimes of dirt and contagion, but more often of interfering with others, and of meeting with rudeness and repulse. And though there is nothing much to be nervous about, yet undoubtedly visiting and establishing relationships with the working classes is a thing that has to be learnt, and those will not be very successful who have never been taught how to do it. But have we none to put them in the way? Again, what are called "Mothers' Meetings" might perhaps be introduced with advantage amongst ourselves; and other associations for the encouragement and benefit of those who are endeavouring to preserve their homes in purity and order. A very good work often done in this country, though involving some trouble and sacrifice, is that of picking out from the school or parish one or two of the best children, and taking some pains to train them in work or household duties, giving them a taste for doing things in a nice, clean, orderly way. This is a great help to their getting good situations, and so is a reward to those parents who take care of their children. Then as regards the help and visiting of those who are needy and struggling—might we not, except in cases of pressing destitution, aim at assisting those who make sacrifices for the order of their home and the good of their children, and not let the strength of our efforts be spent on the worthless? Our ancestors saw the wisdom of so ordering their charities as to give special encouragement to the honest and industrious, and though we may have but little to give, yet it might be wise to distribute that little in such a way as to show a constant recognition of the same principle. It is not the amount given that is prized so much as the attention that is shown and the respect that is excited.

But we have already exceeded due limits, and must bring our observations to a close. If what we have suggested may seem to any to be visionary or to wear an air of novelty, yet it is fair to remember that a course of action is not therefore impractical because it is unpractised. But here we can say more, that it is practical, because it is practised. What we have ventured to set forth on this subject is not anything evolved from our inner consciousness, but things that in an experience of many years we have seen and heard. We have taken our suggestions from what we have witnessed in actual life, believing that what is done with success amongst others may be still more fruitful amongst ourselves, and that what is found to be eminently successful when done in a few cases, and on a small scale, must, if done on a large scale and by many produce proportionately great results.

We can succeed, but shall we?

ART. IX.—THEOLOGY, PAST AND PRESENT, AT
MAYNOOTH.

1. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi, ad usum Theologicæ Candidatorum.* Auctore, Lud. Aegid. Delahogue. Editio tertia. Dublinii, 1829.
2. *Theologia Moralis, ad usum Seminariorum.* Auctore, Ludovico Bailly. Dublinii, 1828.
3. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi.* Auctore, Patricio Murray. Dublinii, 1866.

ON Friday, the fifth of June, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-five, Royal assent was given to an Act of Incorporation, intituled "An Act for the better Education of Persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic Religion" (35 George III., c. 21). We must look upon the words "better education" as a phrase of legal fiction, there having been previously no education good or bad provided for, or even tolerated in, "persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic Religion." Just one hundred years before, by the provisions of a statute of the Irish Parliament styled "an Act to prevent the increase of Popery," it had been prohibited under penalties of fine, forfeiture, and imprisonment, "to give children a foreign education," whilst the same penalties were enacted against Catholic teachers at home, or the children who learned from them. The first article of the Treaty of Limerick had guaranteed that

The Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland; or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the Second; and their Majesties, as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a Parliament in this kingdom, will endeavour to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in that particular as may preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their said religion.

The guarantee was given on the 3rd of October, 1691. The "Act to prevent the increase of Popery" was passed in 1695, and continued in full unrelenting force to the 5th of June, 1795. What a sad, dreary, dismal century was that for the old faith and its followers in Ireland! How mightily was the Church of Ireland upheld by God and floated like another ark through the deluge of persecution that encompassed it for that sorrowful hundred years! It is not a mere point of pious belief this faith, which is strong in us Irish Catholics, that it must have been in the designs of the Lord that our Church should not fall away,

and that when He addressed the Twelve in these words of comfort and of promise—"Ego elegi vos et posui vos, ut eatis et fructum afferatis et fructus vester maneat,"—He did not mean to confine to them this special election to a faithful Apostolate, but foresaw and preordained others also, amongst them with special predilection, Patrick, to a productive ministry and an abiding work.

The first break in that leaden sky overhanging Catholic Ireland throughout the eighteenth century of our Christian era, was the introduction of this Bill of 1795. The so much vaunted volunteers of '82, with all their parade of Irish Nationality, contemplated only their own Ireland, the Ireland of the minority; they had not a thought for Catholic Ireland. In the year 1794 the Irish Bishops, seeing that France, hitherto the main nursery of their priests, was shut against them by the operation of the Revolution, and observing an appreciable change in the bearing of the Legislature towards the Catholic hierarchy, took courage and presented a memorial to the Earl of Westmoreland, at that time Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, through the Most Reverend Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, "praying a royal license for the endowment of academies and seminaries for educating and preparing young persons to discharge the duties of Roman Catholic clergymen in Ireland, under ecclesiastical superiors of their own communion." The result of the memorial was the passing, in the following year, of the Act 35 George III.

A fearful crisis in the Irish Church was thus met. We cannot help regarding it as the most alarming peril to which she has, in all her eventful history, been exposed. In all her previous difficulties, her sister Churches of Spain, Portugal, Belgium, but more than all the rest, of France, had trained up her young ecclesiastics, and had sent on detachment after detachment of well-disciplined soldiers of Christ to fight for her the battle of the faith. Devoted Irish Catholics had given their worldly goods to establish burses in foreign colleges for the education of Irish priests, that the Irish mission might not fail. Now, overwhelming disasters, looking like utter ruin, had overtaken those sister Churches themselves, and impiety, in the name of liberty, had seized upon the Irish moneys that had been invested in French securities on the credit of France. Forbidden under penalties the most distressing to educate their ecclesiastics at home, and now without a possibility of their being educated abroad, what were the prelates of Ireland to do? Was this old Church, that had outlived so many and such crushing persecutions, to die out now for want of workmen? This had actually been the case in Wales, and partly so in the Highlands of Scotland. We may well conjecture with what intensity of prayer they

raised their hearts to the Great Master and cried out, "Domine, mitte operarios in messem tuam!" Their prayer, or rather the prayer of Patrick for them, was heard. The college of Maynooth was established, and through it the Church of Ireland has ever since been abundantly and unfailingly supplied with sound and earnest missionary priests. We have said abundantly; we might have said superabundantly. The Church of Ireland has been enabled, through the college of Maynooth, not only to adequately meet the wants of her own mission, but out of her fulness, as in the old days, to subsidize with Irish students poorly served missions throughout the Christian world. The records of the Church in America, Australia, China, India, the English Colonies, and the lists of the Societies of Jesus and of Vincent de Paul are thickly studded with the names of single-minded, earnest bishops and priests, who, with grateful remembrance and feelings of commendable pride, refer to Maynooth as their alma mater. The fecundity of the Irish Church in missionary priests, through its great ecclesiastical nursery, is not however our subject just now, and we cannot therefore afford to dwell upon it longer, highly interesting and instructive a topic though it be.

Our main purpose in this Paper is to note some remarkable transitions in the teaching of the theological school of the great Irish Seminary, and to point the moral to be gathered therefrom. We shall not therefore burthen our essay, or tax the attention of our readers, by long extracts from the Bill of June 5th, 1795; nevertheless, some noteworthy points in it so press themselves forward that we cannot refuse them a passing notice. The Bill commences thus:

Whereas, by the laws now in force in this kingdom, it is not lawful to endow any college or seminary for the education exclusively of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and it is now become expedient that a seminary should be established for that purpose: Be it therefore enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that, &c.

Here follow the names of the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Justices, the Chief Baron, some Catholic noblemen, Baronets, and gentlemen, the four Roman Catholic Archbishops, and five, I presume the senior, Bishops of Ireland.

And the persons to be hereafter elected, as by this Act is directed, shall be trustees for the purpose of establishing, endowing, and maintaining one academy for the education only of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion . . . and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the annual value of one thousand pounds.

The reader will not fail to observe, how the illegality of Catholic teaching establishments generally is recited, and thus equivalently re-enacted in this very Bill *in capite*. The concession is of *one* seminary, no more, for fear, we suppose, of the Catholics becoming too learned; and the property legally acquirable by this one seminary is limited to 1000*l.* a year, lest, perhaps, it should become too rich, for a Popish institution. There seems to be a deep-rooted antipathy in our rulers to the education of Catholics, unaccountable on any rational showing, but very persistent. At that time, their objection was to Catholics being educated at all; at the present time their objection is to *their* being asked to pay anything towards the education of Catholics. "Behold, we have removed all religious disabilities," say our modern lawgivers; "we have thrown open all places and appointments, and Catholics can now freely compete on equal terms with the members of all other denominations. But one thing we set our faces against henceforward, and that is, denominational endowment." Yes, they do set their faces against denominational endowment *henceforward*. Let them also set their faces against it *hencebackward*, and they will establish something of equality. A well-bred colt, without the advantage of perfect training, may be brought to Epsom Downs and started in the Derby, and *then* and *there* he competes on equal terms with the other horses in the race. That is, he has not to run a greater distance than they; he has not to carry any special weight; and if, a thing not to be dreamed of, he pass the Judge's chair first, he wins. These are the equal terms on which Catholics compete with others in the race of education. There are training places for the others, not for them. If they can train themselves they are welcome to do so, but the State will not help them a bit. This bragging of our statesmen about the present fairness of educational competition, whilst Catholics alone are left without an educational subsidy, is amongst the most plainly dishonest assumptions of current English politics.

2. And be it enacted, That it shall and may be lawful for any Popish ecclesiastic to officiate in a chapel or building to be appointed for that purpose by said trustees, or any seven or more of them; any law, statute, or provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

How strangely this reads to-day! So stringent was the prohibition of all Catholic places of worship, and all officiating in them, that it required a special clause to legalise even in this Government-established college, "a chapel or building for any Popish ecclesiastic to officiate in," the officiating itself being at the same time made lawful, but only for the college about to be established, and for the place in that college "appointed for that

purpose by the said trustees." These are indeed hard beginnings for the young Irish ecclesiastical seminary.

The next clause of the Act arresting our attention is the 9th, running thus:—

9. Provided always that it shall not be lawful to receive into, or educate or instruct, in the said academy, any person professing the Protestant religion, or whose father professed the Protestant religion; and that any president, master, professor, or teacher, who shall instruct any one in the said academy, professing the Protestant religion, shall remain liable to such pains and penalties as he would have been liable to before the passing of this Act.

The legislators of 1795 were thus avowed, and one might say bigoted, denominationalists. From motives of policy, or perhaps pity, probably both, they relaxed some of the cruel enactments up to that time in force, and sanctioned the founding of a Catholic College, but it must be a *Catholic* College. They will have no mixing up of Protestant with the Catholic pupils in the new institution, under pain of renewal of all the old penalties against the transgressors, and they will not allow to the Lord-Lieutenant himself any power of interference in by-laws, rules, or regulations affecting the Roman Catholic religion, such as he possesses over all other by-laws, rules, or regulations, made by the Board of Trustees. Finally, when on occasion of visitations, any question relating to the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic religion comes up for investigation, its decision is to be left to the Roman Catholic visitors exclusively. The provisions to this effect are deserving of citation. It had been provided in clause 7 of 40 George III., c. 85:—"That all by-laws, rules, regulations, and statutes, made for the government of the said College, shall, in order to give them validity, be approved by the Lord-Lieutenant." Clause 8 immediately limits and modifies the said provision thus:—"And be it enacted, that nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to any by-laws, rules and regulations, affecting the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, or the doctrine or discipline or worship thereof, within the said college or seminary." Clause 9 then refers to the visitorial powers in matters of religion, which it regulates as follows:—"And be it further enacted, that in all matters which relate to the exercise, doctrine, and discipline of the Roman Catholic religion, the visitorial powers over said college shall be exercised exclusively by such of the said visitors as are or shall be of the Roman Catholic religion." Tenacious though the King, Lords, and Commons at the close of the last century were, of their power of excluding Catholics from education altogether, or of restricting it, in their case, to certain persons and places, they still did not fail to see the justice and

the wisdom of granting it, when they did grant it at all, in the form in which Catholics could consistently accept it, that is, as Catholic education, and exclusively such.

The Irish prelates of the day, men in whom zeal, courage, and prudence seem to have been admirably blended, fashioned, one might say by the hand of Providence, to meet the emergency of the times, were not slow to take advantage of the opportunity offered them of a domestic education for their clergy. A college was opened at Maynooth within a very few months of the passing of the Bill of Toleration, and the task of securing a staff of competent professors was facilitated for the Bishops by the same events that had deprived them of their former sources of clerical education. The suppression of the ecclesiastical seminaries of France, and the forced expatriation of their staffs, threw many distinguished teachers of philosophy and theology, so to speak, on the market. These were only too delighted to settle down in any place where they would be allowed to keep their heads on their shoulders, and follow the bent of their studies. Frugal fare and a very moderate pension contented them. This was what exactly suited the humble resources of the new College. The chance thus afforded was, on the whole, an advantage, but bringing with it a great disadvantage, as we shall soon see.

Maynooth in this way got her first professors from France, and with them an importation of genuine French theology. French theology was exclusively studied by her *alumni*, and French theological authorities alone consulted by them for generations. Indeed it takes not many years to count back to the period at which French principles still continued to tincture her teaching, and through it the views of the Irish clergy at large. We must be understood as speaking of the French theology of the past, for the French theology of our times has, almost universally, wisely assimilated itself to the received standards of theological teaching throughout the Church. But a bitter set of exclusivists were those early French professors. The Most Rev. Dr. Denvir, late Bishop of Down and Connor, when Professor of Physics in Maynooth, one day on his return from Dublin, announced in the presence of Dr. Anglade, Professor of Moral Theology, that he had purchased a copy of Lacroix. "Lacroix!" exclaimed the doctor, "but did you bring him home? Believe me, I would not sleep in the same room with him." This abhorrence of the less rigorous theology was not merely sentimental, as the students were made to know and feel. If one of them was found in the public library reading the same Lacroix, or any of the probabilist theologians, he would at once become *suspect*. If the Casuist Diana was found in a student's hand, in all human probability he would never be promoted to orders; certainly never without

thorough purgation of the contempt thus shown of the principles of rigid morality in which he was being trained. An "Index prohibitorius" was regularly established, which included the greatest and most authoritative writers "in re morali." Liguori himself, even after his beatification, was not safe from censure. A student on one occasion venturing to quote an opinion of his, was abruptly checked by the professor, who gave his estimate of our great guide in moral theology thus—"homo equidem eximie pietatis, sed perditè laxus." And this professor was only the pupil of the Frenchmen. What an unreasoning intolerant was that Gallicanism!

Gallicanism in dogmatic theology, Gallicanism in moral theology, the Gallicanism of the Sorbonne, the Gallicanism of the *Clerus Gallicanus* of the last century, was the teaching brought to Maynooth by the French refugee professors, and there carefully cultivated for nearly half a century. The treatises of Dr. Delahogue "de Ecclesia," "de Sacramentis," "de Penitentia," &c. are its faithful expression. Though the evil has now passed away, one cannot help regretting that a sounder theological system had not been introduced into our schools from the first. Had it been, not only would the time, so valuable for the formation of a well-grounded and scientific theological faculty have been saved, but the young priests, when commencing their missionary career, on finding the studies they had made in college practical and applicable in their every-day duties, would have been induced to continue to read, and not allowed their class books to lie dust-covered and mouldering on their shelves, as so much useless literary lumber. Many an old priest has been heard to say that, once he found himself involved in the business of the mission, he had to fling away his books, he could not work with them, and "take to common sense." A wonderful change has taken place in the reading habits of our priests since that time. On this we shall have more to say later on.

The temporary loss and disadvantage to our National College, and through it to the Irish Mission, is one of the least of the disastrous results of this most pretentious but unsound theory. Its persistent endeavours to bring all things, even the privileges of Christ's Church, into servile subjection to the throne, must have done much towards lessening the reverence of the French people for their bishops and clergy who were so identified with it. Its repulsive rigour in the management of consciences must have largely aggravated and intensified this alienation of feeling of people from priests, and both together may, without rashness of statement, be allotted a place and share with the other predisposing causes of the first French Revolution.

It saddens a theologian to think that the *placita* of Gallicanism

ever had a footing amongst tolerated theological opinions, but it exasperates him to hear it styled a theological school, as it sometimes is. Theological schools hail from great minds, as were those of S. Thomas and of Scotus, divinely helped to construct and furnish with expositions and arguments that glorious science, resting one foot on inspired truth, and the other on human reason, whose function is to subserve the unfailing and unerring central authority to which Christ has committed the keeping of His truth. "*Ego rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua.*" The Gallican school hails from Louis IX. and his Pragmatic Sanction, doubtfully (as we shall see); from John Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, in the Council of Constance, certainly. On particular questions, such as that of Grace, theological schools have diverged widely, and held their positions stubbornly; still their divergence always terminated within the two limits of reason and defined truth; but some at least of the principles of Gallicanism indicate a divergence from undoubted theological truth, which, if logically followed out, cannot always fall within the admitted lines. We feel that to justify our statements, which may to some appear too strongly put, and to make the question raised more intelligible, we shall have to push somewhat further into this subject of Gallicanism.

The French theology of the eighteenth century exhibits two anomalous departures from the common teaching: First, Gallicanism; second, an exorbitantly severe system of Ethics. The former had for its end and object the upholding of the "*Libertates Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ*" which it did *per fas et nefas*; the latter penetrated into all questions of Christian morality, to their very minutest details, and rendered the following of our Lord anything but a "*jugum suave*" and "*onus leve.*" The "*Declaration of the Gallican clergy*," 1682, is the authorized exposition of Gallicanism. It commences as follows:—"Cleri Gallicani de ecclesiastica potestate Declaratio. Die 19a Martii 1682. Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ decreta et libertates a majoribus nostris tanto studio propugnata, earumque fundamenta sacris canonibus et Patrum traditioni nixa, multi diruere moliantur." After a little further preamble the Assembly comes directly to the point—

To prevent which inconveniences we, Archbishops and Bishops, assembled at Paris under royal mandate, representing the Gallican Church, in conjunction with others acting as deputies, after careful consideration, have determined on enacting and declaring the following:—

First. That to blessed Peter and his successors, vicars of Christ and to the Church itself, was granted by God power over things spiritual and pertaining to eternal salvation, and not over civil and temporal matters.

Second. That power over spiritual things belongs to the Apostolic See and to the successors of Peter, vicars of Christ, in such a manner that the decrees of the holy Ecumenical Synod of Constance, on the authority of general councils, contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, approved by the Holy See itself, and confirmed by the usage of the Roman Pontiffs themselves and of the universal Church, and guarded by the Gallican Church with constant religious care, shall be held valid and unshaken, &c.

Third. That hence the exercise of the apostolic power is to be moderated according to the canons framed under the guidance of the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the reverence of the entire world. Moreover, that the rules, customs and institutions, adopted by the kingdom and by the Gallican Church, do remain in force, and that the limits set by the fathers remain undisturbed, &c.

Fourth. That in questions of faith, the principal part belongs to the Roman Pontiff, and that his decrees extend to all and each of the Churches; but, however, that his judgment is not irreformable, unless the consent of the Church be added.

An unworthy and miserable profession of faith is this for the great French Church. A great Church she has always been, prominent amongst Churches for the distinguished Saints she has given to the world, for the ardour of her missionary zeal, for the number and variety of works of Christian utility she has originated and upheld. She was a great Church even at the date of the issuing of this wretched Declaration, and it must not be overlooked that out of one hundred and thirty bishops, thirty-four only, with thirty-five priests, deputies, were subscribers. But then, as now, the most demonstrative were taken as the representative individuals, and the whole French Church was stamped with a character which in reality might have belonged only to a small minority of its bishops and priests. The dominating influence of the Sorbonne, however, which we may picture to ourselves with the rest of the servile courtiers, watching at the foot of the throne to catch the direction of the royal views, and which unfortunately stands before us in history as the mouthpiece of the *Clerus Gallicanus*, contributed, and largely, to make the whole Church of France appear to be responsible for Gallicanism.

Now, what is the gist of those four articles so studiously and painfully concocted in the Assembly in 1682? It lies in three points—the depression of the Pope, the elevation of the king, and the endeavour to establish a singular, more strictly speaking an impossible, position for the *Ecclesia Gallicana*. Article I. takes away from the Pope all temporal power, direct or indirect. It marks with great precision the boundary of his spiritual domain, outside which he is not in any case to move, lest he should trespass on the preserves of kings. It does not, however, in turn fix the boundary line of the temporal domain, and as we

shall see in a short time, it allows to kings a free entrance on several points of the spiritual enclosure. Article I. concedes to Peter and his successors a God-given power over spiritual things, but lest this God-given power should assume too much and extend its influence too far, it is restricted in Article II. by the ruling of the fourth and fifth Sessions of the Council of Constance, that traditional check to the "self-sufficiency" and "domineering spirit" of the Roman Pontiffs. What a pity it is that there were not a few more Councils of Constance celebrated!

Of this Article II. we have more to say than we wish to say. Its statement about the decree of the Council of Constance, we are afraid to express it in English, *scatet mendaciis*. It is not true, in the first place, that the decrees of the fourth and fifth Sessions were decrees of an Ecumenical Synod. An Ecumenical Synod is representative of the Universal Church, whereas at the making of these decrees, only one of the three Obediences into which the contending claims of three doubtful Popes had divided the Universal Church was represented—that of John XXIII. The number of bishops present at the fourth and fifth Sessions are given in the *acta concilii* as seventy. Secondly, it is not true that these decrees were "approved by the Apostolic See." Martin V., in the Council itself, approved only what was done *conciliariter*, i.e., with observance of the essential conditions of an Ecumenical Council. The essential condition of "ecumenicity in celebration" we have just shown to have been wanting here. Taken in the sense of Article II., as asserting the absolute superiority of a General Council over the Pope, certain as well as dubious, Martin puts them out of court altogether—1st, by assuming to himself the province of *defining*, leaving to the Council the office of *approving*; 2nd, by forbidding appeal from the Pope to a Council; 3rd, by dissolving the Synod of Constance on his own authority, and refusing to confirm what had been done in the Council before his appointment, except what had been decreed in "*materia fidei, et conciliariter, nec aliter nec alio modo.*" All this shows more of the master than of the subject. Lastly, it is not true that the usage of Roman Pontiffs and of the entire Church has confirmed the said decree. This is a most daring assertion, without the shadow of a single fact in history to rest upon. The only bit of truth in the whole Article is, where it says that the decrees were ever "guarded by the Gallican Church with religious care."

Article III. does not think the apostolic power sufficiently depressed by making it subject to a General Council: it finds it necessary "to moderate the use of that power," at least in France, by holding "the rules, customs, and institutions of the kingdom and Church of France" exempt from its control. All these

deductions being made, very little even of spiritual authority remains to Peter and his successors, and though he still is permitted to retain a leading part in matters of faith, even there, too, he is dependent; his judgments "to be or not to be" hang upon the word of the Church.

Article IV. Whilst the Pope is thus studiously depressed (it is not pleasant to have to admit it), the king is as studiously exalted. The archbishops and bishops of this Assembly, representing, so they say, the *Ecclesia Gallicana*, have met at Paris *Regio Mandato*. They feel themselves bound to declare that Christ's "kingdom is not of this world," and that we are bound to render unto Cæsar "the things that are Cæsar's," and that "every soul is to be subject to higher powers," and that therefore kings and princes are not to be "subjected in temporals to any ecclesiastical power." The solicitude of the Churches weighed upon S. Paul, the solicitude of the kings and princes weighed upon the thirty-four bishops of the Assembly of 1682. In their receipt for "moderating the exercise of the Apostolic power," the adoption of certain "rules, customs, and institutions" by the king is admitted as an ingredient of equal efficacy with the adoption of the same by the Church. And (who will believe it?) at this very crisis the king was invading the rights of the French Dioceses, and the Pope was doing all he could to protect them. Verily, it is a deplorable production, this declaration of the Clerus Gallicanus; but, according to Fénélon, we have to thank Bossuet that it was not very much worse. Article III. was at first framed so as to assert the right of appeal from a Pope to a Council; but Bossuet insisted on the omission of the clause, saying that such appeals had been always condemned. In this he was more orthodox than logical, for if the Pope be subject to the Council, as the Article teaches, then the right of appeal lies from him to it, as "*ab inferiore tribunali ad superius.*" The Bishop of Tournai fought hard to have it laid down in Article IV., that not only the Pope but the Apostolic See could become heretical; but the Bishop of Meaux well observed that "the faith of Peter could never fail in his See," "and that the centre of unity of faith could never become the centre of error." One regrets that he did not allow these premises to have their full logical value with him, and he might have learned from them that the decrees of the *Sedes Apostolica* are *not* reformatable by the Church. The admirers of Bossuet hold that he saved the French Church from dissolution at the crisis of 1682. It may be so, but certainly her escape from dissolution was followed by a very tedious and troublesome infirmity. We are firmly persuaded that he could have done much more than he did at that particular junction for the purifying and exalting of the views of the French clergy, and that with his vast learning and splendid in-

tellest he should have acquitted himself of better service in the assembly of his National Church than the patching up of a few theological differences, and the originating or supporting of an ephemeral system of accommodation in some questions of ecclesiastical dispute. Where now is his plan of harmonious adjustment of *fallible* Pope, *necessary* centre of unity, of faith, and *infallible* Church?

By an edict of Louis XIV. the doctrine of the four Articles was ordered to be held in all schools, universities, and seminaries of the kingdom, and the theological licentiate in the University of Paris was not permitted to go in for his degree of Master unless the same doctrine was expressly recorded amongst the theses which he undertook to defend. This infamous legislation cast a blight over the theological intelligence of the secular clergy of France for centuries. The malign influence in some instances forced its way even within the sanctuary of the religious orders. We cannot help admiring the deep research and lucid style of Natalis Alexander, take him as historian or theologian; yet in matters of Church authority we do not follow him without misgiving, nor do we receive his expositions without distrust. We are enchanted with the clearness, the order, the accuracy of Carriere in his "Treatise on Matrimony;" we can read it almost as flowingly as a pleasant story-book, until we come upon some question of the "power of princes to institute diriment impediments," or the rights of the French Bishops to dispense in the same, when he sets himself to discuss gravely and learnedly and lengthily, opinions stale even to offensiveness. We feel thenceforth neither interest nor pleasure in accompanying him in his vain attempts to set a face of reason upon absurdity, and we put by his book, sad and disappointed. Of Tournely, Collet, hosts of others, like things might be said.

It is not, we must add, in schools of theology alone, or within the Church only, that Gallicanism has been mischievous. It has proved itself an armoury, out of which heresy has been abundantly supplied with weapons wherewith to assail Catholic truth. It has prepared the material out of which erring children are ever forging excuses for continuing to remain outside their Father's house. Look at the bewildered spirit of Dr. Pusey taking comfort to itself from the perusal of "long extracts from Bossuet's memorable defence of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy." "We have seen," writes Bossuet, "this tradition deduced from the apostles to the eight first General Councils. Which eight General Councils are the foundations of the whole Christian doctrine and discipline; the four first of which the Catholic Church, after S. Gregory, venerates no otherwise than the four Gospels." It is not within the scope of this Paper to enter into

other errors conveyed by suggestion, in this unsound and dangerous passage. We shall content ourselves with giving "the denial flat" to the assertion that the "first eight General Councils are the foundations of the whole Christian doctrine and discipline," a denial which the veriest tyro in sacred science will promptly re-echo. Not even for the trumping up of an argument for the Gallican theory of a superior Council and inferior Pope, is it intelligible how Bossuet could have written such words. No wonder that Pusey observes that :

If the authority of the Roman See in the time of Henry VIII. had only been that which Bossuet speaks of as the legitimate exercise of that authority—enforcing the observance of the canons, but regulated and *limited* by them, leaving the right of appointment to ecclesiastical offices to those in whom they were of old canonically vested, as they were secured in France by the Pragmatic Sanction—there would have been no room for the abuses which were complained of for centuries and unremedied, and which furnished an excuse to which Henry VIII. appealed.

And now, too, I believe, that the recognition of the principles of Bossuet would remove the objections both of people and clergy.—*Is Healthful Re-union Impossible?*

But to our subject. Louis Aegidius Delahogue, Doctor of the sacred faculty of Paris, Fellow of the Sorbonne, and Professor *Emeritus* of theology in the Sorbonne schools, "cælum non animum mutans," was chosen professor of dogmatic theology in the Seminary of Maynooth, and lectured to and composed treatises for successive generations of the students thereof. These treatises, and the moral theology of Bailly, they were obliged to purchase. They were their class-books. There was no alternative from the Sorbonne theology for them, except what lay silent in the tomes of the college library, sources of knowledge which, as we have already seen, they were not at all encouraged to approach. Hence, as an inevitable consequence, the Irish clergy became Gallican to the core. The classic theologians of the Church, Suarez and Lugo, and Molina and Petto, were to them names unknown or proscribed; they were a little familiar with Bellarmine, "de Sacramentis," and "de Eucharistia," but Bossuet was the great central theological luminary, not of the French Church only, but of the Church universal. An alien theology, possessing for us neither national nor other interest, thus balefully affected the youth and the manhood of the Irish Church, narrowing their views, misdirecting their professional studies, and, if not entirely estranging their feelings of allegiance, at least sensibly weakening them towards the true object of Catholic loyalty.

Dr. Louis Delahogue wrote a treatise on the Church, and

lectured the students of Maynooth in dogmatic theology, in the early decades of the present century. Dr. Patrick Murray wrote a treatise on the Church, and with his associate professors lectured in dogmatic theology, of another stamp, in the fifth, sixth, and seventh decades. The anomaly of a "Council above the Pope," as a tenable proposition, exists for them no longer. The theological puzzle of a centre of unity, to which all Catholics are bound to conform, and which, though itself errable, could not lead them into error, exercises their ingenuity no more. The straining of judgment and of inventiveness to reconcile the *privilege* which Christ asked, and doubtless obtained, for Peter that he should "confirm his brethren," and the *commission* which He gave him "to feed his sheep," and "to feed his lambs," with the fallibility of Peter's successors, is at length at an end. "Romanus Pontifex jurisdictione superior est omnibus Episcopis conjunctim, sive dispersis sive in Concilio generali congregatis." "Romanus Pontifex universam Ecclesiam obligatorie docens, infallibilis est." — Murray *de Ecclesia*, Disp. xx. What a transition is here recorded! And in so short a period of time! And without any theological revolution to account for it! There was no local discountenancing of the old teaching; there was no importation of professors trained up in other schools; but, by the sheer honest following out of principles inculcated on them by Gallican masters, the Irish-born theologians of the College of Maynooth forced their way through the lines of Gallicanism, and formed a successful junction with the grand theological army of the Catholic Church. Two conclusions flow irresistibly from these facts; first, the innate infirmity of the Gallican theory, which tottered and fell directly the artificial props supporting it were removed; second, the natural intellectual clearness of perception and theological aptitude of the Irish student.

The other notable departure of the theology of the French Church from the common teaching was exhibited in the excessive rigour of its moral theology. In this part, however, it was not altogether as singular as in its Gallicanism. Its position was not entirely as isolated. The schools of Maynooth, and through them the Irish priesthood, of course imbibed the French ethics from the same sources that had imparted to them the French dogma. The prevailing classbook was Bailly, reference to Collet being also encouraged. Bailly held his ground in this capacity, until his name appeared in the "Index Librorum prohibitorum," where it was placed on December 7, 1852, *donec corrigatur*. It is right to remark that the correction required had reference to his dogmatic, and not to his moral, theology. The latter it was that was used by the students of Maynooth. They did use

his treatise "de Gratia" occasionally, but we are satisfied that the flaw in his teaching did not lie there. This was the theology that drove the Maynooth educated priests of former days to the necessity of putting aside what they had learned in college and deciding questions, as used to be said, by "common sense;" common sense or practical sense was obviously called in to tone down in an unscientific way the severity of the principles of a too rigorous morality. The great defect of rigorous theology is its unfitness for the work of the missionary priest. It is rather speculative than practical. It has no accommodativeness. It sets up a high standard of Christian demeanour, and declares that if our conduct is what it is bound to be, it must measure so high. It fashions a faultless model, to which it points and proclaims, "this is the type of Christian excellence; to this you must conform, or exterior darkness and weeping and gnashing of teeth are your lot." With hammer and chisel and brush you must chip and pare and polish, until you make of yourself a true and faithful copy. Mediocrity is not tolerated; the alternatives are perfection or perdition. Rigorism has little pity, has no patience, makes no allowance for human nature or its varying phases of infirmity. It is always seeking to guide men uphill, with whip uplifted and with tightened rein. Like the Pharisees in the Scripture narrative it has a great zeal for the *law*. It would never have said to the sinning woman in the eighth chapter of S. John, "Neither will I condemn thee; go now and sin no more."

The rigorism of the Gallican School was not the worst of its kind. It had not the soul-destroying tendency of the Jansenistic rigorism (the infection of which it did not, however, entirely escape), but it was for all that, an obstructive and a dangerous code of morality. Like Gallicanism it was highly intolerant, and was wont to use most unmeasured language towards the professors of the milder systems of ethics, laying at their door all the evils and sins, in fact the decadence, of modern society. At the same time itself was repelling men from the sacraments and blocking the way to Christ. *Sacramenta propter homines*, was not amongst its *principia*, but it seemed to keep up a perpetual howl of, *Nolite sanctum dure canibus*. The mild or benign theology, on the contrary, made it its study to seek out such opinions, as, keeping carefully within God's law, made the observance of that law easiest for men. It proposed to itself to attract, not to repel, to facilitate, not to make things difficult, for the sinner. The great and holy men who adopted it for teaching and for practice, understood human nature well, and made allowance for human infirmity within the permissible limits. They also understood how the most dangerous net which the adversary casts around

the sinner, is that which is woven out of persuasions of the impossibility of observing the law of Christ, and the insuperable difficulty of conversion. S. Alphonsus Liguori and Benedict XIV., two names standing for more in theology than all the rigorist writers together, have by the weight of their authority, and the conclusiveness of their arguments, now finally excluded rigorism from the schools. The latter devotes the whole of the eleventh book of his "*Synodus Diœcesana*" to the confutation of rigid opinions, and everywhere throughout his writings quotes with respect and approbation the representatives of benign opinions. The former gave a long life of study and labour to the propagation of the same, and merited to obtain from the illustrious Pontiff of whom we are speaking the commendation of his book as "*exquisitissimum atque integræ hominum societati certo approbatissimum et utilissimum.*" The sanction of the works of S. Liguori, as *safe to follow* in the chair of theology or the tribunal of penance, given by the Sacred Penitentiary, July, 1831, removed the last doubt that remained about the use of the probabilistic theory, and practically expelled rigorism from the Church.

The transition from severe to moderate principles of morality came about in Maynooth at the same time, and is due to the same influences as those that had operated in the case of Gallicanism, and showed as complete a revolution. That same Lacroix whom Dr. Anglade would not tolerate under the same roof with him, became a favourite book of reference with the students of moral theology, and was regularly found in their private collection of books, and there used to be in our student days in the College many a laugh amongst the young probabilists over the solemn outburst of Dr. Delahogue's rigorism in his "*Treatise of Penance*," when, looking back with a sort of horror on the mild teaching of the Casuists of the last century, and congratulating himself that the evil day had passed, he exclaimed, "*Quando vigeat eheu probabilismus!*"

HENRY F. NEVILLE.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS
DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPÆ XIII.
EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

*Venerabilibus Fratribus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis et
Episcopis Universis Catholici Orbis, gratiam et communionem
cum Apostolica Sede habentibus.*

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

AETERNI Patris Unigenitus Filius, qui in terris apparuit, ut humano generi salutem et divinae sapientiae lucem afferret, magnum plane ac mirabile mundo contulit beneficium, cum caelos iterum ascensurus. Apostolis praecepit, ut *euntes docerent omnes gentes*;* Ecclesiamque a se conditam communem et supremam populorum magistram reliquit, Homines enim, quos veritas liberaverat, veritate erant conservandi: neque diu permansissent caelestium doctrinarum fructus, per quos est homini parta salus, nisi Christus Dominus erudiendis ad fidem mentibus perenne magisterium constituisset. Ecclesia vero divini Auctoris sui cum erecta promissis, tum imitata caritatem, sic iussa perfecit, ut hoc semper spectarit, hoc maxime voluerit, de religione praecipere et cum erroribus perpetuo dimicare. Huc sane pertinent singulorum Episcoporum vigilati labores; huc Conciliorum perlatae leges ac decreta, et maxime Romanorum Pontificum sollicitudo quotidiana, penes quos, beati Petri Apostolorum Principis in primatu successores, et ius et officium est docendi et confirmandi fratres in fide.—Quoniam vero, Apostolo monente, *per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam*† Christi-fidelium mentes decipi solent, et fidei sinceritas in hominibus corrumpi, idcirco supremi Ecclesiae Pastores muneris sui perpetuo esse duxerunt etiam veri nominis scientiam totis viribus provehere, simulque singulari vigilantia providere, ut ad fidei catholicae normam ubique traderentur humanae disciplinae omnes, praesertim vero *philosophia*, a qua nimirum magna ex parte pendet ceterarum scientiarum recta ratio. Id ipsum et Nos inter cetera breviter monuimus, Venerabiles Fratres, cum primum Vos omnes per Litteras Encyclicas allocuti sumus; sed modo rei gravitate, et temporum conditione compellimur rursus Vobiscum agere de ineunda philosophicorum studiorum ratione, quae et bono fidei apte respondeat, et ipsi humanarum scientiarum dignitati sit consentanea.

Si quis in acerbiter nostrorum temporum animum intendat, earumque rerum rationem, quae publice et privatim geruntur, cogita-

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

† Coloss. ii. 8.

tionem complectatur, is profecto comperiet, secundam malorum causam, cum eorum quae premunt, tum eorum quae pertimescimus, in eo consistere, quod prava de divinis humanisque rebus scita, e scholis philosophorum iampridem profecta, in omnes civitatis ordines irrepserint, communi plurimorum suffragio recepta. Cum enim insitum homini natura sit, ut in agendo rationem ducem sequatur, si quid intelligentia peccat, in id et voluntas facile labitur: atque ita contingit, ut pravitas opinionum, quarum est in intelligentia sedes, in humanas actiones influat, easque pervertat. Ex adverso, si sana mens hominum fuerit, et solidis verisque principiis firmiter insistat, tum vero in publicum privatumque commodum plurima beneficia progignet.— Equidem non tantam humanae philosophiae vim et auctoritatem tribuimus, ut cunctis omnino erroribus propulsandis, vel evellendis parem esse iudicemus: sicut enim, cum primum est religio christiana constituta, per admirabile fidei lumen *non persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis* diffusum, *sed in ostensione spiritus et virtutis*,* orbi terrarum contigit ut primaevae dignitati restitueretur; ita etiam in praesens ab omnipotenti potissimum virtute et auxilio Dei expectandum est, ut mortalium mentes, sublatis errorum tenebris, respiciant. Sed neque spernenda, neu posthabenda sunt naturalia adiumenta, quae divinae sapientiae beneficio, fortiter suaviterque omnia disponentis, hominum generi suppetunt; quibus in adiumentis rectum philosophiae usum constat esse praecipuum. Non enim frustra rationis lumen humanae menti Deus inseruit; et tantum abest, ut superaddita fidei lux intelligentiae virtutem extinguat aut imminuat, ut potius perficiat, auctisque viribus, habilem ad maiora reddat.—Igitur postulat ipsius divinae Providentiae ratio, ut in revocandis ad fidem et ad salutem populis etiam ab humana scientia praesidium quaeratur: quam industriam, probabilem ac sapientem, in more positam fuisse praeclarissimorum Ecclesiae Patrum, antiquitatis monumenta testantur. Illi scilicet neque paucas, neque tenues rationi partes dare consueverunt, quas omnes perbrevis complexus est magnus Augustinus, *huic scientiae tribuens . . . illud quo fides saluberrima . . . gignitur, nutritur, defenditur, roboratur*.†

Ac primo quidem philosophia, si rite a sapientibus usurpetur, iter ad veram fidem quodammodo sternere et munire valet, suorumque alumnorum animos ad revelationem suscipiendam convenienter praeparare: quamobrem a veteribus modo *praevia ad christianam fidem institutio*,‡ modo *christianismi praeludium et auxilium*,§ modo *ad Evangelium paedagogus*|| non immerito appellata est.

Et sane benignissimus Deus, in eo quod pertinet ad res divinas, non eas tantum veritates lumine fidei patefecit, quibus attingendis impar humana intelligentia est, sed nonnullas etiam manifestavit, rationi non omnino impervias, ut scilicet, accedente Dei auctoritate, statim et sine aliqua erroris admixtione omnibus innotescerent. Ex quo factum est, ut quaedam vera, quae vel divinitus ad credendum proponuntur, vel cum doc-

* 1 Cor. ii. 4.

† De Trin. lib. xiv. c. 1.

‡ Clem. Alex., Strom. lib. i. c. 16; l. vii. c. 3.

§ Orig. ad Greg. Thaum.

|| Clem. Alex., Strom. i. c. 5.

trina fidei arctis quibusdam vinculis colligantur, ipsi ethnicorum sapientes, naturali tantum ratione praelucente, cognoverint, aptisque argumentis demonstraverint ac vindicaverint. *Invisibilia enim ipsius*, ut Apostolus inquit, *a creatura mundi per ea, quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur, sempiterna quoque eius virtus et divinitas*;* et gentes quae legem non habent . . . ostendunt nihilominus opus legis scriptum in cordibus suis.† Haec autem vera, vel ipsis ethnicorum sapientibus explorata, vehementer est opportunum in revelatae doctrinae commodum utilitatemque convertere, ut reipsa ostendatur, humanam quoque sapientiam, atque ipsum adversariorum testimonium fidei christianae suffragari. Quam agendi rationem, non recens introductam, sed veterem esse constat, et sanctis Ecclesiae Patribus saepe usitatam. Quin etiam venerabiles isti religiosarum traditionum testes et custodes formam quamdam eius rei et prope figuram agnoscunt in Hebraeorum facto, qui Aegypto excessuri, deferre secum iussi sunt argentea atque aurea Aegyptiorum vasa cum vestibus pretiosis, ut scilicet, mutato repente usu, religioni veri Numinis ea supellex dedicaretur, quae prius ignominiosis ritibus et superstitioni inservierat. Gregorius Neocaesariensis‡ laudat Origenem hoc nomine, quod plura ex ethnicorum placitis ingeniose decerpta, quasi erepta hostibus tela, in patrociniū christianae sapientiae et perniciem superstitionis singulari dexteritate retorserit. Et parem disputandi morem cum Gregorius Nazianzenus,§ tum Gregorius Nyssenus|| in Basilio Magno et laudant et probant; Hieronymus vero magnopere commendat in Quadrato Apostolorum discipulo, in Aristide, in Iustino, in Irenaeo, aliisque permultis.¶ Augustinus autem, *Nonne aspicimus*, inquit, *quanto auro et argento et veste suffarcinatus exierit de Aegypto Cyprianus, doctor suavissimus et martyr beatissimus? quanto Lactantius? quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hilarius? ut de vivis taceam, quanto innumerabiles Graeci?*** Quod si vero naturalis ratio opimam hanc doctrinae segetem prius fudit, quam Christi virtute fecundaretur, multo uberiores certe progignet, posteaquam Salvatoris gratia nativas humanae mentis facultates instauravit et auxit.—Ecquis autem non videat, iter planum et facile per huiusmodi philosophandi genus ad fidem aperiri?

Non his tamen limitibus utilitas circumscribitur, quae ex illo philosophandi instituto dimanat. Et revera divinae sapientiae eloquiis graviter reprehenditur eorum hominum stultitia, qui *de his quae videntur bona, non potuerunt intelligere Eum qui est; neque, operibus attendentes, agnoverunt quis esset artifex*.†† Igitur primo loco magnus hic et praeclarus ex humana ratione fructus capitur, quod illa Deum esse demonstret: *a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturae cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri*.‡‡—Deinde Deum ostendit omnium perfectionum cumulo singulariter excellere, infinita in primis sapientia, quam nulla usquam res latere, et summa iustitia, quam pravus nunquam vincere possit affectus, ideoque Deum non solum veracem esse, sed ipsam etiam veritatem falli et fallere nesciam. Ex quo consequi perspicuum

* Rom. i. 20.

† Ibid. ii. 14, 15.

‡ Orat. paneg. ad Origen.

§ Vit. Moys.

|| Carm. i. Iamb. 3.

¶ Epist. ad Magn.

** De doctr. christ. l. ii. c. 40.

†† Sap. xiii. 1.

‡‡ Ibid. xiii. 5.

est, ut humana ratio plenissimam verbo Dei fidem atque auctoritatem conciliet.—Simili modo ratio declarat, evangelicam doctrinam mirabilibus quibusdam signis, tamquam certis certae veritatis argumentis, vel ab ipsa origine emicuisse: atque ideo omnes, qui Evangelio fidem adiungunt, non temere adiungere, tamquam doctas fabulas secutos,* sed rationali prorsus obsequio intelligentiam et iudicium suum divinae subiicere auctoritati. Illud autem non minoris pretii esse intelligitur, quod ratio in perspicuo ponat, Ecclesiam a Christo institutam (ut statuit Vaticana Synodus) *ob suam admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus locis fecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum esse motum credibilitatis, et divinae suae legationis testimonium irrefragabile.*†

Solidissimis ita positis fundamentis, perpetuus et multiplex adhuc requiritur philosophiae usus, ut sacra Theologia naturam, habitum, ingeniumque verae scientiae suscipiat atque induat. In hac enim nobilissima disciplinarum magnopere necesse est, ut multae ac diversae caelestium doctrinarum partes in unum veluti corpus colligantur, ut suis quaeque locis convenienter dispositae, et ex propriis principiis derivatae apto inter se nexu cohaereant; demum ut omnes et singulae suis iisque invictis argumentis confirmentur.—Nec silentio praetereunda, aut minimi facienda est accuratior illa atque uberior rerum, quae creduntur, cognitio, et ipsorum fidei mysteriorum, quoad fieri potest, aliquanto lucidior intelligentia, quam Augustinus alique Patres et laudarunt et assequi studuerunt, quamque ipsa Vaticana Synodus‡ fructuosissimam esse decrevit. Nam siquidem cognitionem et intelligentiam plenius et facilius certe illi consecuntur, qui cum integritate vitae fideique studio ingenium coniungunt philosophicis disciplinis expoliturum, praesertim cum eadem Synodus Vaticana doceat, eiusmodi sacrorum dogmatum intelligentiam *tum ex eorum, quae naturaliter cognoscuntur, analogia; tum e mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo* peti oportere.§

Postremo hoc quoque ad disciplinas philosophicas pertinet, veritates divinitus traditas religiose tueri, et iis qui oppugnare audeant resistere. Quam ad rem, magna est philosophiae laus, quod fidei propugnaculum ac veluti firmum religionis munimentum habeatur. *Est quidem, sicut Clemens Alexandrinus testatur, per se perfecta et nullius indiga Servatoris doctrina, cum sit Dei virtus et sapientia. Accedens autem graeca philosophia veritatem non facit potentiores; sed cum debiles efficiat sophistarum adversus eam argumentationes, et propulset dolosas adversus veritatem insidias, dicta est vineae apta sepes et vallus.*|| Profecto sicut inimici catholici nominis, adversus religionem pugnaturi, bellicos apparatus plerumque a philosophica ratione mutuuntur, ita divinarum scientiarum defensores plura e philosophiae penu depromunt, quibus revelata dogmata valent propugnare. Neque mediocriter in eo triumphare fides christiana censenda est, quod adversariorum arma, humanae rationis artibus ad nocendum comparata, humana ipsa ratio

* 2 Petr. i. 16.

‡ Const. cit. cap. 4.

† Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath. cap. 3.

§ Ibid.

|| Strom. lib. i. c. 20.

potenter expediteque repellat. Quam speciem religiosi certaminis ab ipso gentium Apostolo usurpatam commemorat S. Hieronymus scribens ad Magnum: *Ductor christiani exercitus Paulus et orator invictus, pro Christo causam agens, etiam inscriptionem fortuitam arte torquet in argumentum fidei: didicerat enim a vero David extorquere de manibus hostium gladium, et Goliath superbissimi caput proprio mucrone truncare.** Atque ipsa Ecclesia istud a philosophia praesidium christianos doctores petere non tantum suadet, sed etiam iubet. Etenim Concilium Lateranense V. posteaquam constituit, *omnem assertionem veritati illuminatae fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse, eo quod verum vero minime contradicat,†* philosophiae doctoribus praecipit, ut in dolosis argumentis dissolvendis studiose versentur; siquidem, ut Augustinus testatur, *si ratio contra divinarum Scripturarum auctoritatem redditur, quamlibet acuta sit, fallit veri similitudine; nam vera esse non potest.‡*

Verum ut pretiosis hisce, quos memoravimus, afferendis fructibus par philosophia inveniatur, omnino oportet, ut ab eo tramite numquam deflectat, quem et veneranda Patrum antiquitas ingressa est, et Vaticana Synodus solemni auctoritatis suffragio comprobavit. Scilicet cum plane compertum sit, plurimas ex ordine supernaturali veritates esse accipiendas, quae cuiuslibet ingenii longe vincunt acumen, ratio humana, propriae infirmitatis conscia, maiora se affectare ne audeat, neque easdem veritates negare, neve propria virtute metiri, neu pro lubitu interpretari; sed eas potius plena atque humili fide suscipiat, et summi honoris loco habeat, quod sibi liceat, in morem ancillae et pedisequae, famulari caelestibus doctrinis, easque aliqua ratione, Dei beneficio, attingere.—In iis autem doctrinarum capitibus, quae percipere humana intelligentia naturaliter potest, aequum plane est, sua methodo, suisque principiis et argumentis uti philosophiam: non ita tamen, ut auctoritati divinae sese audacter subtrahere videatur. Imo, cum constet, ea quae revelatione innotescunt, certa veritate pollere, et quae fidei adversantur pariter cum recta ratione pugnare, noverit philosophus catholicus se fidei simul et rationis iura violaturum, si conclusionem aliquam amplectatur, quam revelatae doctrinae repugnare intellexerit.

Novimus profecto non deesse, qui facultates humanae naturae plus nimio extollentes, contendunt, hominis intelligentiam, ubi semel divinae auctoritati subiiciatur, e nativa dignitate excidere, et quodam quasi servitutis iugo denissimam plurimum retardari atque impediri, quominus ad veritatis excellentiaeque fastigium progrediatur.—Sed haec plena erroris et fallaciae sunt; eoque tandem spectant, ut homines, summa cum stultitia, nec sine crimine ingrati animi, sublimiores veritates repudient, et divinum beneficium fidei, ex qua omnium bonorum fontes etiam in civilem societatem fluxere, sponte reiciant. Etenim cum humana mens certis finibus, iisque satis angustis, conclusa teneatur, pluribus erroribus, et multarum rerum ignorationi est obnoxia. Contra fides christiana, cum Dei auctoritate nitatur, certissima est veritatis magistra; quam qui sequitur, neque errorum laqueis irretitur, neque

* Epist. ad Magn.

† Bulla, *Apostolici regiminis*.

‡ Epist. 143, (al 7) ad Marcellin., n. 7.

incertarum opinionum fluctibus agitur. Quapropter qui philosophiae studium cum obsequio fidei christianae coniungunt, ii optime philosophantur: quandoquidem divinarum veritatum splendor, animo exceptus, ipsam iuvat intelligentiam; cui non modo nihil de dignitate detrahit, sed nobilitatis, acuminis, firmitatis plurimum addit.—Cum vero ingenii aciem intendunt in refellendis sententiis, quae fidei repugnant, et in probandis, quae cum fide cohaerent, digne ac perutiliter rationem exercent: in illis enim prioribus, causas erroris deprehendunt, et argumentorum, quibus ipsae fulciuntur, vitium dignoscunt: in his autem posterioribus, rationum momentis potiuntur, quibus solide demonstrantur et cuilibet prudenti persuadeantur. Hac vero industria et exercitatione augeri mentis opes et explicari facultates qui neget, ille veri falsique discrimen nihil conducere ad profectum ingenii, absurde contendat necesse est. Merito igitur Vaticana Synodus praeclara beneficia, quae per fidem rationi praestantur, his verbis commemorat: *Fides rationem ab erroribus liberat ac tuetur, eamque multiplici cognitione instruit.** Atque ideo homini, si saperet, non culpanda fides, veluti rationi et naturalibus veritatibus inimica, sed dignae potius Deo grates essent habendae, vehementerque laetandum, quod, inter multas ignorantiae causas et in mediis errorum fluctibus, sibi fides sanctissima illuxerit, quae, quasi sidus amicum, citra omnem errandi formidinem portum veritatis commonstrat.

Quod si, Venerabiles Fratres, ad historiam philosophiae respiciatis, cuncta, quae paullo ante diximus, re ipsa comprobare intelligetis. Et sane philosophorum veterum, qui fidei beneficio caruerunt, etiam qui habebantur sapientissimi, in pluribus deterrime errarunt. Nostis enim, inter nonnulla vera, quam saepe falsa et absona, quam multa incerta et dubia tradiderint de vera divinitatis ratione, de prima rerum origine, de mundi gubernatione, de divina futurorum cognitione, de malorum causa et principio, de ultimo fine hominis, aeternaque beatitudine, de virtutibus et vitiis, aliisque doctrinis, quarum vera certaue notitia nihil magis est hominum generi necessarium.—Contra vero primi Ecclesiae Patres et Doctores, qui satis intellexerant, ex divinae voluntatis consilio, restitutorem humanae etiam scientiae esse Christum, qui Dei virtus est Deique sapientia,† et *in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiae et scientiae absconditi,‡* veterum sapientum libros investigandos, eorumque sententias cum revelatis doctrinis conferendas suscepere: prudentique delectu quae in illis vere dicta et sapienter cogitata occurrerent, amplexi sunt, ceteris omnibus vel emendatis, vel reiectis. Nam providissimus Deus, sicut ad Ecclesiae defensionem martyres fortissimos, magnae animae prodigos, contra tyrannorum saevitiem excitavit, ita philosophis falsi nominis aut haereticis viros sapientia maximos obiecit, qui revelatarum veritatum thesaurum etiam rationis humanae praesidio tuerentur. Itaque ab ipsis Ecclesiae primordiis, catholica doctrina eos nacta est adversarios multo infensissimos, qui christianorum dogmata et instituta irridentes, ponebant plures esse deos, mundi materiam principio causaque caruisse, rerumque cursum caeca quadam vi et fatali contineri necessitate, non divinae

* Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath. cap. 4.

† 1 Cor. i. 24.

‡ Coloss. ii. 3.

providentiae consilio administrari. Iamvero cum his insanientis doctrinae magistris mature congressi sunt sapientes viri, quos *Apologetas* nominamus, qui, fide praeunte, ab humana quoque sapientia argumenta sumpserunt, quibus constituerent, unum Deum, omni perfectionum genere praestantissimum esse colendum; res omnes e nihilo omnipotenti virtute productas, illius sapientia vigere, singulasque ad proprios fines dirigi ac moveri.—Principem inter illos sibi locum vindicat *S. Iustinus* martyr, qui posteaquam celeberrimas graecorum Academias, quasi experiendo, lustrasset, plenoque ore nonnisi ex revelatis doctrinis, ut idem ipse fatetur, veritatem hauriri posse pervidisset, illas toto animi ardore complexus, calumniis purgavit, penes Romanorum Imperatores acriter copioseque defendit, et non pauca graecorum philosophorum dicta cum eis composuit. Quod et *Quadratus*, et *Aristides*, *Hermias* et *Athenagoras* per illud tempus egregie praestiterunt.—Neque minorem in eadem causa gloriam adeptus est *Irenaeus*, martyr invictus, Ecclesiae Lugdunensis Pontifex: qui cum strenue refutaret perversas orientalium opiniones, Gnosticorum opera per fines romani imperii disseminatas, *origines haereseon singularum* (auctore Hieronymo), et *ex quibus philosophorum fontibus emanarint . . . explicavit*.^{*}—Nemo autem non novit *Clementis Alexandrini* disputationes, quas idem Hieronymus sic, honoris causa, commemorat: *Quid in illis indoctum? imo quid non de media philosophia est?*[†] Multa ipse quidem incredibili varietate disseruit ad condendam philosophiae historiam, ad artem dialecticam rite exercendam, ad concordiam rationis cum fide conciliandam utilissima.—Hunc secutus *Origenes*, scholae Alexandrinae magisterio insignis, graecorum et orientalium doctrinis eruditissimus, perplura eademque laboriosa edidit volumina, divinis litteris explanandis, sacrisque dogmatibus illustrandis mirabiliter opportuna; quae licet erroribus, saltem ut nunc extant, omnino non vacent, magnam tamen complectuntur vim sententiarum, quibus naturales veritates et numero et firmitate augentur.—Pugnat cum haereticis *Tertullianus* auctoritate sacrarum Litterarum; cum philosophis, mutato armorum genere, philosophice; hos autem tam acute et erudite convincit, ut iisdem palam fidenterque obiiciat: *Neque de scientia, neque de disciplina, ut putatis, aequamur*.[‡]—*Arnobius* etiam, vulgatis adversus gentiles libris, et *Lactantius* divinis praesertim Institutionibus, pari eloquentia et robore dogmata ac praecepta catholicae sapientiae persuadere hominibus strenue nituntur, non sic philosophiam evertentes, ut Academici solent,[§] sed partim suis armis, partim vero ex philosophorum inter se concertatione sumptis eos revincentes.¶—Quae autem de anima humana, de divinis attributis, aliisque maximi momenti quaestionibus, magnus *Athanasius* et *Chrysostomus* oratorum princeps, scripta reliquerunt, ita, omnium iudicio, excellunt, ut prope nihil ad illorum subtilitatem et copiam addi posse videatur.—Et ne singulis recensendis nimii simus, summorum numero virorum, quorum est mentio facta, adiungimus *Basilium* magnum et utrumque

^{*} Epist. ad Magn.

[†] Loc. cit.

[‡] Apologet. § 46.

[§] Iust. vii. cap. 7.

¶ De opif. Dei, cap. 21.

Gregorium, qui, cum Athenis, ex domicilio totius humanitatis, exiissent philosophiae omnis apparatu affatim instructi, quas sibi quisque doctrinae opes inflammato studio pepererat, eas ad haereticos refutandos, instituendosque christianos converterunt.—Sed omnibus veluti palmam praeripuisse visus est *Augustinus*, qui ingenio praepotens, et sacris profanisque disciplinis ad plenum imbutus, contra omnes suae aetatis errores acerrime dimicavit fide summa, doctrina pari. Quem ille philosophiae locum non attigit; imo vero quem non diligentissime investigavit, sive cum altissima fidei mysteria et fidelibus aperiret, et contra adversariorum vesanos impetus defenderet; sive cum, Academicorum aut Manichaeorum commentis deletis, humanae scientiae fundamenta et firmitudinem in tuto collocavit, aut malorum, quibus premuntur homines, rationem et originem et causas est persecutus? Quanta de Angelis, de anima, de mente humana, de voluntate et libero arbitrio, de religione et de beata vita, de tempore et aeternitate, de ipsa quoque mutabilitum corporum natura subtilissime disputavit?—Post id tempus per Orientem *Ioannes Damascenus*, Basilii et Gregorii Nazianzeni vestigia ingressus, per Occidentem vero *Boëthius* et *Anselmus*, Augustini doctrinas professi, patrimonium philosophiae plurimum locupletarunt.

Exinde mediae aetatis Doctores, quos *Scholasticos* vocant, magnae molis opus aggressi sunt, nimirum segetes doctrinae fecundas et uberes, amplissimis Sanctorum Patrum voluminibus diffusas, diligenter congerere, congestasque uno velut loco condere, in posterorum usum et commoditatem.—Quae autem scholasticae disciplinae sit origo, indoles et excellentia, iuvat hic, Venerabiles Fratres, verbis sapientissimi viri, Praedecessoris Nostri, Sixti V. fusius aperire: “Divino Illius munere, qui solus dat spiritum scientiae et sapientiae et intellectus, quique Ecclesiam suam per saeculorum aetates, prout opus est, novis beneficiis auget, novis praesidiis instruit, inventa est a maioribus nostris sapientissimis viris, Theologia scholastica, quam duo potissimum gloriosi Doctores, angelicus S. Thomas et seraphicus S. Bonaventura, clarissimi huius facultatis professores, . . . excellenti ingenio, assiduo studio, magnis laboribus et vigiliis excoluerunt atque ornarunt, eamque optime dispositam, multisque modis praeclare explicatam posteris tradiderunt. Et huius quidem tam salutaris scientiae cognitio et exercitatio, quae ab uberrimis divinarum Litterarum, summorum Pontificum, sanctorum Patrum et Conciliorum fontibus dimanat, semper certe maximum Ecclesiae adiumentum afferre potuit, sive ad Scripturas ipsas vere et sane intelligendas et interpretandas, sive ad Patres securius et utilius perlegendos et explicandos, sive ad varios errores et haereses detegendas et refellendas: his vero novissimis diebus, quibus iam advenerunt tempora illa periculosa ab Apostolo descripta, et homines blasphemii, superbi, seductores proficiunt in peius, errantes et alios in errorem mittentes, sane catholicae fidei dogmatibus confirmandis et haeresibus confutandis pernecessaria est.”* Quae verba quamvis Theologiam scholasticam dumtaxat complecti videantur, tamen esse quoque de Philosophia eiusque laudibus accipienda perspicitur. Siquidem prae-

* Bulla, *Triumphantis*, an. 1588.

claræ dotes, quæ Theologiam scholasticam hostibus veritatis faciunt tantopere formidolosam, nimirum, ut idem Pontifex addit, "apta illa et inter se nexa rerum et causarum cohaerentia, ille ordo et dispositio tamquam militum in pugnando instructio, illae dilucidæ definitiones et distinctiones, illa argumentorum firmitas et acutissimæ disputationes, quibus lux a tenebris, verum a falso distinguitur, hæreticorum mendacia multis præstigiis et fallaciis involuta, tamquam veste detracta, patefiunt et denudantur,"* præclaræ, inquam, et mirabiles istæ dotes unice a recto usu repetendæ sunt eius philosophiæ, quam magistri scholastici, data opera et sapienti consilio, in disputationibus etiam theologicis, passim usurpare consueverunt.—Praeterea cum illud sit scholasticorum Theologorum proprium ac singulare, ut scientiam humanam ac divinam arctissimo inter se vinculo coniunxerint, profecto Theologia, in qua illi excelluerunt, non erat tantum honoris et commendationis ab opinione hominum adeptura, si mancā atque imperfectam aut levem philosophiam adhibuissent.

Iamvero inter Scholasticos Doctores, omnium princeps et magister, longe eminet *Thomas Aquinas*; qui, uti Caëtanus animadvertit, veteres doctores sacros quia summe veneratus est, ideo intellectum omnium quodammodo sortitus est.† Illorum doctrinæ, velut dispersa cuiusdam corporis membra, in unum Thomas collegit et coagmentavit, miro ordine digessit, et magnis incrementis ita adauxit, ut catholici Ecclesiæ singulare præsidium et decus iure meritoque habeatur.—Ille quidem ingenio docilis et acer, memoria facilis et tenax, vitæ integerimus, veritatis unice amator, divina humanaque scientia prædives, Soli comparatus, orbem terrarum calore virtutum fovit, et doctrinæ splendore complevit. Nulla est philosophiæ pars, quam non acute simul et solide pertractarit: de legibus ratiocinandi, de Deo et incorporeis substantiis; de homine aliisque sensibilibus rebus, de humanis actibus eorumque principiis ita disputavit, ut in eo neque copiosa quaestionum seges, neque apta partium dispositio, neque optima procedendi ratio, neque principiorum firmitas aut argumentorum robur, neque dicendi perspicuitas aut proprietas, neque abstrusa quæque explicandi facilitas desideretur.

Illud etiam accedit, quod philosophicas conclusiones angelicus Doctor speculatus est in rerum rationibus et principiis, quæ quamlatissime patent, et infinitarum fere veritatum semina suo velut gremio concludunt, a posterioribus magistris opportuno tempore et uberrimo cum fructu aperienda. Quam philosophandi rationem cum in erroribus refutandis pariter adhibuerit, illud a se ipse impetravit, ut et superiorum temporum errores omnes unus debellarit, et ad profligandos, qui perpetua vice in posterum exoriturus sunt, arma invictissima suppeditarit.—Praeterea rationem, ut par est, a fide apprime distinguens, utramque tamen amice consocians, utriusque tum iura conservavit, tum dignitati consuluit, ita quidem ut ratio ad humanum fastigium Thomæ pennis evecta, iam fere nequeat sublimius assurgere; neque fides a ratione fere possit plura aut validiora adiumenta præstolari, quam quæ iam est per Thomam consecuta.

* Bull. cit.

† In 2^m. 2^{ae}, q. 148, a. 4. in fin.

Has ob causas, doctissimi homines, superioribus praesertim aetatibus, theologiae et philosophiae laude praestantissimi, conquisitis incredibili studio Thomae voluminibus immortalibus, angelicae sapientiae eius sese non tam excolendos, quam penitus innutriendos tradiderunt.— Omnes prope conditores et legiferos Ordinum religiosorum iussisse constat sodales suos, doctrinis S. Thomae studere et religiosius haerere, cauto, ne cui eorum impune liceat a vestigiis tanti viri vel minimum discedere. Ut Dominicanam familiam praetereamus, quae summo hoc magistro iure quodam suo gloriatur, ea lege teneri Benedictinos, Carmelitas, Augustinianos, Societatem Iesu, aliosque sacros Ordines complures, statuta singulorum testantur.

Atque hoc loco magna cum voluptate provolat animus ad celeberrimas illas, quae olim in Europa floruerunt, Academias et Scholas, Parisiensem nempe, Salmantinam, Complutensem, Duacenam, Tolosanam, Lovaniensem, Patavinam, Bononiensem, Neapolitanam, Conimbricensem, aliasque permultas. Quarum Academiarum nomen aetate quodammodo crevisse, rogatasque sententias, cum graviora agerentur negotia, plurimum in omnes partes valuisse, nemo ignorat. Iamvero compertum est, in magnis illis humanae sapientiae domiciliis, tamquam in suo regno, Thomam consedissem principem; atque omnium vel doctorum vel auditorum animos miro consensu in unius angelici Doctoris magisterio et auctoritate conquievisse.

Sed, quod pluris est, Romani Pontifices Praedecessores Nostri sapientiam Thomae Aquinatis singularibus laudum praeconiis, et testimoniis amplissimis prosecuti sunt. Nam Clemens VI,* Nicolaus V,† Benedictus XIII‡ alique testantur, admirabili eius doctrina universam Ecclesiam illustrari; S. Pius V§ vero fatetur eadem doctrina haereses confusas et convictas dissipari, orbemque universum a pestiferis quotidie liberari erroribus; alii cum Clemente XII,|| uberima bona ab eius scriptis in Ecclesiam universam dimanasse, Ipsumque eodem honore colendum esse affirmant, qui summis Ecclesiae doctoribus, Gregorio, Ambrosio, Augustino et Hieronymo defertur; alii tandem S. Thomam proponere non dubitarunt Academiis et magnis Lyceis exemplar et magistrum, quem tuto pede sequerentur. Qua in re memoratu dignissima videntur B. Urbani V verba ad Academiam Tolosanam: *Volumus et tenore praesentium vobis iniungimus, ut B. Thomae doctrinam tamquam veridicam et catholicam sectemini, eandemque studeatis totis viribus ampliare.*¶ Urbani autem exemplum Innocentius XII** in Lovaniensi studiorum Universitate, et Benedictus XIV†† in Collegio Dionysiano Granatensium renovarunt.—His vero Pontificum maximorum de Thoma Aquinate iudiciis, veluti cumulus, Innocentii VI testimonium accedat: *Huius (Thomae), doctrina prae ceteris, excepta canonica, habet proprietatem verborum, modum dicendorum, veritatem sententiarum, ita ut numquam qui eam tenuerint, inve-*

* Bulla, *In Ordine*.

† Breve ad FF. Ord. Praedic. 1451.

Bulla, *Pretiosus*.

§ Bulla, *Mirabilis*.

|| Bulla, *Verbo Dei*.

¶ Const. 5^a dat. die 3 Aug. 1368 ad Cancell. Univ. Tolos.

** Litt. in form. Brev., die 6 febr. 1694.

†† Ibid., die 21 Aug. 1752.

*niantur a veritatis tramite deviasse; et qui eam impugnaverit, semper fuerit de veritate suspectus.**

Ipsa quoque Concilia Oecumenica, in quibus eminet lectus ex toto orbe terrarum flos sapientiae, singularem Thomae Aquinati honorem habere perpetuo studuerunt. In Conciliis Lugdunensi, Viennensi, Florentino, Vaticano, deliberationibus et decretis Patrum interfuisse Thomam et pene praefuisse dixeris, adversus errores Graecorum, haereticorum et rationalistarum ineluctabili vi et faustissimo exitu decertantum.—Sed haec maxima est et Thomae propria, nec cum quopiam ex doctoribus catholicis communicata laus, quod Patres Tridentini, in ipso medio conclavi ordini habendo, una cum divinae Scripturae codicibus et Pontificum Maximorum decretis *Summam* Thomae Aquinatis super altari patere voluerunt, unde consilium, rationes, oracula peterentur.

Postremo haec quoque palma viro incomparabili reservata videbatur, ut ab ipsis catholici nominis adversariis obsequia, praeconia, admirationem extorqueret. Nam exploratum est, inter haereticarum factionum duces non defuisse, qui palam profiterentur, sublata semel e medio doctrina Thomae Aquinatis, se facile posse *cum omnibus* catholicis doctoribus *subire certamen et vincere, et Ecclesiam dissipare.*†—Inanis quidem spes, sed testimonium non mane.

His rebus et causis, Venerabiles Fratres, quoties respicimus ad bonitatem, vim praeclarasque utilitates eius disciplinae philosophicae, quam maiores nostri adamarunt, iudicamus temere esse commissum, ut eidem suus honos non semper, nec ubique permanserit: praesertim cum philosophiae scholasticae et usum diuturnum et maximorum virorum iudicium, et, quod caput est, Ecclesiae suffragium favisse constaret. Atque in veteris doctrinae locum nova quaedam philosophiae ratio hac illac successit, unde non ii precepti sunt fructus optabiles ac salutare, quos Ecclesia et ipsa civilis societas maluissent. Adnitentibus enim Novatoribus saeculi XVI, placuit philosophari citra quempiam ad fidem respectum, petita dataque vicissim potestate quaelibet pro lubitu ingenioque excogitandi. Qua ex re pronum fuit, genera philosophiae plus aequo multiplicari, sententiasque diversas atque inter se pugnantes oriri etiam de iis rebus, quae sunt in humanis cognitionibus praecipuae. A multitudine sententiarum ad haesitationes dubitationesque persaepe ventum est: a dubitationibus vero in errorem quam facile mentes hominum delabantur, nemo est qui non videat.—Hoc autem novitatis studium, cum homines imitatione trahantur, catholicorum quoque philosophorum animos visum est alicubi pervasisse: qui patrimonio antiquae sapientiae posthabito, nova moliri, quam vetera novis augere et perficere maluerunt, certe minus sapienti consilio, et non sine scientiarum detrimento. Etenim multiplex haec ratio doctrinae, cum in magistrorum singulorum auctoritate arbitrioque nitatur, mutabile habet fundamentum, eaque de causa non firmam atque stabilem neque robustam, sicut veterem illam, sed nutantem et levem facit philosophiam. Cui si forte contingat, hostium impetu ferendo vix parem aliquando inveniri, eius rei agnoscat in seipsa

* Serm. de S. Thom.

† Beza, Bucerus.

residere causa et culpam.—Quae cum dicimus, non eos profecto improbamus doctos homines atque solertes, qui industriam et eruditionem suam, ac novorum inventorum opes ad excolendam philosophiam afferunt: id enim probe intelligimus ad incrementa doctrinae pertinere. Sed magnopere cavendum est, ne in illa industria atque eruditione tota aut praecipua exercitatio versetur.—Et simili modo de sacra Theologia iudicetur; quam multiplici eruditionis adiumento iuvare atque illustrari quidem placet; sed omnino necesse est, gravi Scholasticorum more tractari, ut, revelationis et rationis coniunctis in illa viribus, *invictum fidei propugnaculum** esse perseveret.

Optimo itaque consilio cultores disciplinarum philosophicarum non pauci, cum ad instaurandam utiliter philosophiam novissime animum adiecerint, praeclaram Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam restituere, atque in pristinum decus vindicare studuerunt et student. Pari voluntate plures ex ordine Vestro, Venerabiles Fratres, eandem alacriter viam esse ingressos, magna cum animi Nostri laetitia cognovimus. Quos cum laudamus vehementer, tum hortamur, ut in suscepto consilio permaneant: reliquos vero omnes ex Vobis singulatim monemus, nihil Nobis esse antiquius et optabilius, quam ut sapientiae rivos purissimos, ex angelico Doctore iugi et praedivite vena dimanantes, studiosae iuventuti large copioseque universi praebeatis.

Quae autem faciunt, ut magno id studio velimus, plura sunt.—Principio quidem, cum in hac tempestate nostra, machinationibus et astu fallacis cuiusdam sapientiae, christiana fides oppugnari soleat, cuncti adolescentes, sed ii nominatim qui in Ecclesiae spem succrescunt, pollenti ac robusto doctrinae pabulo ob eam causam enutriendi sunt, ut viribus validi, et copioso armorum apparatu instructi, mature assuescant causam religionis fortiter et sapienter agere, *parati semper*, secundum Apostolica monita, *ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de ea, quae in nobis est, spe*;† et *exhortari in doctrina sana, et eos qui contradicunt, arguere*.‡—Deinde plurimi ex iis hominibus qui, alienato a fide animo, instituta catholica oderunt, solam sibi esse magistratam ac ducem rationem profitentur. Ad hos autem sanandos, et in gratiam cum fide catholica restituendos, praeter supernaturale Dei auxilium, nihil esse opportunius arbitramur, quam solidam Patrum et Scholasticorum doctrinam, qui firmissima fidei fundamenta, divinam illius originem, certam veritatem, argumenta quibus suadetur, beneficia in humanum genus collata, perfectamque cum ratione concordiam tanta evidentia et vi commonstrant, quanta flectendis mentibus vel maxime invitis et repugnantibus abunde sufficiat.

Domestica vero, atque civilis ipsa societas, quae ob perversarum opinionum pestem quanto in discrimine versetur, universi perspicimus, profecto pacatior multo et securior consisteret, si in Academiis et scholis sanior traderetur, et magisterio Ecclesiae conformior doctrina, qualem Thomae Aquinatis volumina complectuntur. Quae enim de germana ratione libertatis, hoc tempore in licentiam abeuntis, de divina cuiuslibet auctoritatis origine, de legibus earumque vi, de paterno et aequo summorum Principum imperio, de obtemperazione

* Sixtus V, Bull. cit,

† 1 Pet. iii. 15.

‡ Tit. i. 9.

sublimioribus potestatibus, de mutua inter omnes caritate; quae scilicet de his rebus et aliis generis eiusdem a Thoma disputantur, maximum atque invictum robur habent ad evertenda ea iuris novi principia, quae pacato rerum ordini et publicae saluti periculosa esse dignoscuntur.—Demum cunctae humanae disciplinae spem incrementi praecipere, plurimumque sibi debent praesidium polliceri ab hac, quae Nobis est proposita, disciplinarum philosophicarum instauratione. Etenim a philosophia, tamquam a moderatrice sapientia, sanam rationem rectumque modum bonae artes mutuari, ab eaque, tamquam vitae communi fonte, spiritum haurire consueverunt. Facto et constanti experientia comprobatur, artes liberales tunc maxime floruisse, cum incolumis honor et sapiens iudicium philosophiae stetit; neglectas vero et prope oblitteratas iacuisse, inclinata atque erroribus vel ineptiis implicita philosophia.—Quapropter etiam physicae disciplinae, quae nunc tanto sunt in pretio, et tot praeclare inventis, singularem ubique cunctis admirationem sui, ex restituta veterum philosophia non modo nihil detrimenti, sed plurimum praesidii sunt habiturae. Illarum enim fructuosae exercitationi et incremento non sola satis est consideratio factorum, contemplatioque naturae; sed, cum facta constiterint, altius assurgendum est, et danda solerter opera naturis rerum corporearum agnoscendis, investigandisque legibus, quibus parent, et principiis, unde ordo illarum, et unitas in varietate, et mutua affinitas in diversitate proficiscuntur. Quibus investigationibus mirum quantum philosophia scholastica vim et lucem, et opem est allatura, si sapienti ratione tradatur.

Qua in re et illud monere iuvat, nonnisi per summam iniuriam eidem philosophiae vitio verti, quod naturalium scientiarum profectui et incremento adversetur. Cum enim Scholastici, sanctorum Patrum sententiam secuti, in Anthropologia passim tradiderint, humanam intelligentiam nonnisi ex rebus sensibilibus ad noscendas res corpore materiaque carentes evehi, sponte sua intellexerunt, nihil esse philosopho utilius, quam naturae arcana diligenter investigare, et in rerum physicarum studio diu multumque versari. Quod et facto suo confirmarunt: nam S. Thomas, B. Albertus magnus, alique Scholasticorum principes, non ita se contemplationi philosophiae dederunt, ut non etiam multum operae in naturalium rerum cognitione collocarint: imo non pauca sunt in hoc genere dicta eorum et scita, quae recentes magistri probent, et cum veritate congruere fateantur. Praeterea, hac ipsa aetate, plures iique insignes scientiarum physicarum doctores palam aperteque testantur, inter certas ratasque recentioris Physicae conclusiones, et philosophica Scholae principia nullam veri nominis pugnam existere.

Nos igitur, dum edicimus libenti gratoque animo excipiendum esse quidquid sapienter dictum, quidquid utiliter fuerit a quopiam inventum atque excogitatum; Vos omnes, Venerabiles Fratres, quam enixe hortamur, ut ad catholicae fidei tutelam et decus, ad societatis bonum, ad scientiarum omnium incrementum auream sancti Thomae sapientiam restituatis, et quam latissime propagetis. Sapientiam sancti Thomae dicimus: si quid enim est a doctoribus Scholasticis vel nimia subtilitate quaesitum, vel parum considerate traditum, si quid cum exploratis posterioris aevi doctrinis minus cohaerens, vel denique quoquo modo

non probabile, id nullo pacto in animo est aetati nostrae ad imitandum proponi.—Ceterum, doctrinam Thomae Aquinatis studeant magistri, a Vobis intelligenter lecti, in discipulorum animos insinuare; eiusque prae ceteris soliditatem atque excellentiam in perspicuo ponant. Eamdem Academiae a Vobis institutae aut instituendae illustrent ac tueantur, et ad grassantium errorum refutationem adhibeant.—Ne autem supposita pro vera, neu corrupta pro sincera bibatur, provideat ut sapientia Thomae ex ipsis eius fontibus hauriatur, aut saltem ex iis rivis, quos ab ipso fonte deductos, adhuc integros et illimes decurrere certa et concors doctorum hominum sententia est: sed ab iis, qui exinde fluxisse dicuntur, re autem alienis et non salubribus aquis creverunt, adolescentium animos arcendos curate.

Probe autem novimus conatus Nostros irritos futuros, nisi communia cepta, Venerabiles Fratres, Ille secundet, qui *Deus scientiarum* in divinis eloquiis* appellatur; quibus etiam monemur, *omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum esse, descendens a Patre luminum*.† Et rursus: *Si quis indiget sapientia, postulet a Deo, qui dat omnibus affluenter, et non impropert; et dabitur ei*.‡—Igitur hac quoque in re exempla sequamur Doctoris angelici, qui numquam se lectioni aut scriptioni dedit, nisi propitiato precibus Deo; quique candide confessus est, quidquid sciret, non tam se studio aut labore suo sibi peperisse, quam divinitus accepisse; ideoque humili et concordii obsecratione Deum simul omnes exoremus, ut in Ecclesiae filios spiritum scientiae et intellectus emittat, et aperiat eis sensum ad intelligendam sapientiam. Atque ad uberiores percipiendos divinae bonitatis fructus, etiam B. Virginis Mariae, quae sedes sapientiae appellatur, efficacissimum patrociniū apud Deum interponite; simulque deprecatores adhibete purissimum Virginis Sponsū B. Iosephum, et Petrum ac Paullum Apostolos maximos, qui orbem terrarum, impura errorum lue corruptum, veritate renovarunt, et caelestis sapientiae lumine compleverunt.

Denique divini auxilii spe freti, et pastoralī Vestro studio confisi, Apostolicam benedictionem, caelestium munerum auspiciem et singularis Nostrae benevolentiae testem, Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, universoque Klero et populo singulis commissio, peramanter in Domino impertimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 4 Augusti an. 1879.

Pontificatus Nostri Anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

* 1 Reg. ii. 3.

† Iac. i. 17.

‡ Ibid. v. 5.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Scuola Cattolica. Aprile—Luglio, 1879. Milano.
Political Parties in Italy.

SEVERAL consecutive Articles on the political parties in Italy have appeared lately in the *Scuola Cattolica* which contain much interesting matter. The briefest analysis would be far too lengthy for the space at our disposal. We must be satisfied with culling a few remarks on the similarity of aim shared by the two parties, the Moderate or Right, and the Progressist or Left, which are mainly distinguished by a diversity in their respective programmes. It is the Moderate party who from the beginning have had the leadership of the great and fatal revolution brought about in Italy during these last twenty years, and to them must be attributed, at least in the way of direction, those antecedent acts whereby the pretended resurrection of Italy was developed. The objects set before them by both Right and Left have been really identical, whether as regards their religious, governmental, or social policy. The men of the revolution, whatever their colour, have formed but one camp, and have all marched in one direction, the Left or Progressist constituting the van-guard (the advanced party, as they are styled), the Right or Moderate forming the centre and rear-guard. During the first sixteen years of this period, when the Right were in power, we have seen them now resisting the impatience of the Left, and now, when they judged such tactics opportune, feigning an incapability of checking them and a necessity of yielding to their pressure. For these last four years—that is, ever since 1876, when the Left came into office—they have never failed to obtain the concurrence of the Right in their revolutionary enterprises, while at times they have suffered themselves to be influenced by their advice, menaces, or intrigues. In fact, the difference between the two parties consists not in principle, but in the more or less rapid application of the same principles. The Right, if they could have their way, would aim at consolidating the conquests already achieved; in such wise, however, as to obtain a gradual subversive progress, and this principally by continuing to indoctrinate the rising generations with the ideas of “modern civilization,” so that by degrees all religious sentiment should be extinguished in the hearts of Italians, and, through the influence of Italy, in those of other nations, the number of the Pope’s Catholic adherents should thereby be greatly reduced, and his authority so much enfeebled that he would be left, virtually, at their discretion. The same process they would also have carried on in governmental policy. Gradually and cautiously all respect for authority and, in particular, all attachment to its monarchical form and to the dynasty was to be attenuated in youthful minds, and among the people generally,

so that the masses, becoming democratized and habituated to continual legislative changes, should thus be prepared for some great pacific revolution (or evolution, as the proposed transaction is called) on a larger scale. Social transformations were to be brought about in similar style by intoxicating the minds of the lower orders with the ambition of participating in all the advantages of the superior classes, and these, as well as the young of all grades, with a passion for engaging in politics and a desire to hold administrative offices, so that to have a post of that kind should seem preferable in their eyes to the management of their private fortunes and the enjoyment of domestic peace, and that thus the advantage and importance of public and social property should come to supersede in their estimation and affection that of private possessions.

The Left, on attaining power, would have pushed things on at a more accelerated speed, but special reasons have combined to check the immediate carrying out of their programme; the death of Victor Emanuel, that of Pius IX., the election of Leo XIII., inducing a kind of pause and suspension of excited feelings, and the Eastern war turning men's minds to external affairs. But when, after the conclusion of the Treaty of Berlin, the Left saw themselves deluded in their hopes of territorial addition to Italy, agitations in a republican, and even anarchical and international, sense were commenced and connived at so openly by the Ministry, that Passanante's advocate was able justly to reproach them in open court—Cairoli himself being present to give his testimony to the regicidal attempt—with having fostered and encouraged the free enunciation of those very principles which instigated the perpetration of the criminal act. The crime of Passanante led, as all know, to the resignation of the Cairoli Ministry. The tactics of the De Pretis Ministry, formed with the professed view of more energetic repression of open republican agitation, have not been substantially different, and we have now Cairoli once more in office. But notwithstanding the eagerness of the Left for extreme measures, they have met, hitherto, with more retarding obstacles than they had anticipated; some arising from the difficulties caused by the municipal elections, others through the strong opposition encountered by the new matrimonial law.

Limiting ourselves, however, to the point we wish to notice—namely, the essential identity in principle and aim of Right and Left—we may observe that it could not be otherwise, since both parties are the product of the same Mazzinian school, the ideas and projects imbibed therein having been discussed and elaborated in the meetings of those secret societies to which all these men belong. Hitherto the object has been mainly to infiltrate the public mind with those notions, so that they might one day acquire greater liberty of manifestation. That day has now come. The period for giving external and bodily expression to these revolutionary ideas, in their most extreme consequences, has arrived, an office which naturally devolves on the Left. For the machinery by which they propose to effect this object we must refer our readers to the article in the June number of the *Scuola*. We must notice, however, one other feature of difference in the programmes of Right and Left besides that of speed, namely,

that of order. While both concur in the same anti-Christian conspiracy, the Left are disposed to direct the main force of their first onslaught against the *Statuto*, which they have begun in scorn to call the Tables of the Old Law, and against the monarchical dynasty. The rest, that is, the destruction of religion and the present social order, they reckon would follow without difficulty. The Right, more cautious, make the altar the primary object of their direct attacks, seeing that it has neither armies nor bayonets to defend it. The *Statuto* is to be corroded and gradually done away with, according to the plan hitherto pursued by them, and which they consider the surest, although the slowest method. Once eradicate religion from the hearts of the people chiefly through the monopoly of public instruction, and the moral state of human society will thereby be necessarily changed; and along with religion the sense of justice and fidelity having passed away, nothing, they think, and think truly, will be easier than to subvert the throne.

One thing is clear from the examination of the respective programmes of Right and Left, as explained by their leaders, that Minghetti, Bonghi, Sella, and the Right, taken generally, are not less radical than Saffi, Cairoli, and Garibaldi, in their project of utterly destroying the Catholic religion, and extinguishing all religious belief. The anti-Christian programmes of the two parties are, therefore, substantially identical, differing only in their form or mode. Sella himself, the present leader of the Right, when alluding to the difference between them, never said that his party had not the same aims as the Left, but only that the Left sought the desired objects with a policy unenlightened by prudence. Thus Sella would prefer to disseminate error in a more crafty way, while the leaders of the Left boldly denounce the priests and the Papacy as the cankers of Italy, and declare that nothing is so fit to corrupt the youthful mind as the Catechism. In order to provoke less opposition and avoid the reproach of cruelty, Sella and his followers would put the Church and religion to death slowly, feigning all the while to have no desire to injure them, but only as compelled to yield to an imperious necessity. The Left, on the other hand, although circumstances may induce them to pause, as has been observed, in the execution of their purposes, would regard none of these considerations, but would readily lend themselves to the conviction that the time was come to lay violent hands on all that is sacred in Rome and throughout Italy; and, in order to achieve the work of destruction all the quicker, would not shrink as much as would the Right from the effusion of blood, or peradventure making some Cardinal take a bath in the Tiber. Neither would they be so cautious as the Right would be not to provoke, by their indiscreet violence, the general censure of Europe, and even, perhaps, incur the peril of exciting a universal reaction, both internal and external.

La Civiltà Cattolica. 2 Agosto, 1879. Firenze.*The Scale of Crime in Italy.*

AN Article in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of August 2nd furnishes some appalling statistics of the increase of crime of late years in Italy. The "Liberals," Right and Left, are fain to make the same confession, most humiliating to those who have ruled the country during this period of decadence. Not long since one of her former Ministers recorded the sad fact that Italy had a primacy of crime over all the other European States. This was but to repeat with more solemn emphasis a declaration which had already appeared in the Official Gazette of the Kingdom (May 28th, 1877), that homicides were more prevalent in Italy than in other countries. Last November the then Minister, Zanardelli, made the same lamentation. It is a fact too patent to be concealed, so much so that the Inspector General of the Ministry of the Interior, when insisting on the need of a prison reform, could make use of it as a convincing argument in support of the claim. Most of the Liberal journals shirk this awkward topic; a few publicists only, terrified by the magnitude of the evil, inquire into its origin, with the hope of finding a remedy. But if statistics afford evidence which cannot be contravened, reluctance to deny any of the principles or acts of the Revolution prevents them from drawing the logical and obvious conclusions.

The first fact which appears from the official statements is the deplorable primacy of Italy in deeds of blood. From a comparative table of the number of the homicidal convictions in the different European States during the year 1875, it results that in Italy they exceeded those of England, for instance, sixteen times, in proportion to population. To pass from comparative to absolute numbers, it may be added that to the year of 1878 Zanardelli assigns about 4000 homicides and 20,000 injuries by wounds—4000 killed and 20,000 wounded! It is like the slaughter of a regular battle-field. Our horror is increased when we examine the subdivision into classes of these offences, and note the large proportion of parricides, fratricides, infanticides, and murders of husbands and wives.

Now this great increase in crime, which is equally true of other moral offences besides those of murder, has been progressive, and dates from the revolutionary rule in Italy, which was to introduce a new order of things and bring light, civilization, and true morality to a people barbarized under the yoke of preceding Governments and degraded by superstition. New maxims and new institutions were to take the place of those Christian maxims which had hitherto constituted the basis of public morality, and of those numerous institutions, ecclesiastical or animated by the spirit of Christianity, which had so powerfully helped to maintain it. This system has been steadily carried out since the date of its inauguration twenty years ago, which must be considered as ample time for ascertaining its practical results; and what have these been? A continually ascending scale of crime, the progressive deepening of a corrupt and cankerous wound in the bosom of society, appalling the very Liberals themselves, and a brand

of shame imprinted on the face of Italy in sight of all civilized nations. It is hard to conceive how any sober-minded person can fail to deduce the legitimate consequences as regards the merits of the Liberalistic régime. There must surely be some radical vice in a system which bears such fruits. Let us pass over the miserable exhaustion of the country through maladministration, which might be indulgently laid to the charge of the signal incapacity of those men whom this party have unfortunately selected for public offices; let us not stop to inquire whether in matters of political economy Liberalism be not a system ruinous to the material prosperity of the people, there is no denying, at least, that in proportion to the diffusion of its principles and the multiplication of its institutions has been the increase of vice and of crime amongst the population.

Strange to say, some of these revolutionists not only admit the fact, which, indeed, they cannot deny, but allow that progressive increase of crime is a law clearly verified in all civilized polities (civilized in the modern fashion, of course). Thus Lombroso is not ashamed to write that, paradoxical as the assertion may appear, the augmentation in Italy of criminality, especially among females, ought not to grieve us so much, and may, indeed, be regarded as an indication, albeit an unpleasing one, of progress. It is to be presumed, however, that they regard the proof as somewhat excessive, since they endeavour to seek for exculpatory causes in the bad working of some of these new Liberal institutions. The same Lombroso, alluding to the shameful administration of justice, declares that one unquestionable cause of the increase of crime is the evil results of the trial by jury. The independence of the jury has been much lauded, he says, but many cases prove that the jury is often more alarmed than any prisoner brought before them. They are also most accessible to bribery as well as to threats; witness an example he adduces of a rich man, tried for having strangled his wife with the aid of two accomplices, poor men. The rich man was acquitted, the two accomplices were sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment. This is a most ordinary mode of procedure, as is confirmed by the statements of others. The bare-faced injustice of many of the sentences, recorded as examples of the usual character of judicial administration, is not less glaring than their ludicrous stupidity. For instance, in the case of a certain Sebastiano Raineri, the foreman of the jury being asked whether the alleged crime was proved against the accused, replied, "No; with extenuating circumstances;" in which singular verdict he was supported by seven others as wise as himself. To a jury in Piedmont the following interrogations were put:—1. Whether there had been provocation? 2. Whether, in that case, the provocation was of a grave nature? When, in answer to the first question, they replied *No*, and to the second, *Yes*. On one occasion, a jurymen being informed that he was to reply "either Yes or No," wrote down on his paper "either Yes or No." In another trial the jury being asked if the criminal had "*exceeded* in self-defence," decided that he had, because, as their foreman afterwards explained, the culprit's advocate had spoken for more than two hours, and this was "*exceeding* in his defence." We find men let off notwithstanding

reiterated confessions of guilt on their part, and on one occasion eleven gross swindlers acquitted for whom their very advocate had only pleaded extenuating circumstances. A student of Syracuse confessed to an attempt on his professor's life, but the jury pronounced him insane, while an official of Occhiobello was declared not guilty of the theft he had committed, on the plea of irresistible impulse, which, as well as physical temperament, is often brought forward to palliate offences and obtain a favourable verdict.

With such judges, who can wonder at the spread of crime? but is this any excuse for Liberalism, to which Italy is indebted for its present judicial system? The same account is furnished by the above-mentioned inquirers as to other institutions which are its creation; as, for example, the so-called "associations for the moral and material benefit of the people," which said associations are very nurseries of crime, and, according to the valuable testimony of Lombroso, bid fair—that of "mutual aid" included—to become the haunt and the refuge for malefactors. But if these and other evils were removed or rectified, what would it avail without the spirit and practice of religion, which alone can restrain the passions and prevent society from becoming an arena whereon men are exclusively engaged in contending for earthly goods, in which they place their sole beatitude? And it is a remarkable fact that, in seeking out the sources of the increasing immorality of the nation, these modern statisticians never make the slightest allusion to all the arts and devices by which the Liberal regenerators of Italy have striven to banish religion and create a society immersed in atheistic Epicureanism. Yet here is the real root of the evil; all else is but its detestable, but necessary, fruit.

16 Agosto. *Is the Reaction Beginning?*

THE scarecrow of reaction has arisen before the eyes of the revolutionists, because some recent facts are considered to evidence a certain existing desire to restore social and religious order in distracted Europe. The present Article is occupied with an examination of the value of the alleged facts, and next with the consideration whether such a social and religious restoration as the Liberals seem to dread be possible under present circumstances. To the facts themselves, which concern chiefly the Austro-Hungarian and German Empires, and in a less degree Russia, the reviewer does not attach any very great weight as symptoms of an approaching restoration. Those which appear to prelude the adoption of a better policy in the Austro-Hungarian Empire are the most promising. For any gleam of light Catholics must be thankful. Undoubtedly the miseries, moral and physical, under which Europe is groaning, and the greater which loom in no remote distance, are creating a certain desire to return to principles which may act as a check on the pernicious doctrines which are letting loose the passions and inflaming the insatiable cupidities of the masses. Europe shrinks back from the yawning abyss of anarchy, as in the days when the so-called Holy Alliance was devised as

a barrier against the Revolution. Allusion has been made in the present day to this contract between the Allied Sovereigns of 1815 as the model of what Europe might now aim at anew. But, while awarding all due praise to the good intentions of some at least of those sovereigns, the reviewer observes that to make Europe Christian again men must revert for their model to a much earlier date, when unity of faith prevailed. The Holy Alliance was a failure, because it never embodied a solid principle of moral and religious restoration. This had become impossible ever since the Peace of Westphalia, which set its sanction on the non-necessity of religious unity. Europe at that time solemnly ratified the apostacy of peoples, the separation of State from Church, of the Cæsars from the Pope, and banished God from laws, treaties, and all national and international relations. For the contemplated restoration it would be essential that the supernatural order should be recognised as the basis of civilization, and that rulers should accept the magisterium of the Supreme Pontiff. Anything short of this would effect no stable good; it would be a transaction which, while palliating some wounds, would heal none. It would substitute a secret hypocritical war for open hostility, a war still more Satanically crafty in its character; and Europe, after a lull of perhaps a quarter of a century, would be again convulsed by tempests more violent than ever. So it was after the formation of the Holy Alliance, and so it would be again. But kings could not, if they would, form such a compact in the present day. Constitutionalism predominates in Europe now, and the Constitutional monarch, as it is said, "reigns, but does not govern." The men who compose the Ministries which rule in their name are in most cases Liberalistic—that is, Masonic in their origin and anti-Christian in their spirit. From the Catholic people alone might something be expected, if a desire for this restoration was enough. In numbers they are well sufficient to force a better policy on their governors, but the simple multitude is inert and incapable when it lacks impulse and direction. Now this impulse and direction they ought to receive from the cultured classes, but imbued, as are these classes, taken generally, with the modern notions, even when not perverted by rationalism, it were vain to expect such leadership from them; least of all, the reviewer opines, is salvation to be looked for from the party who in Italy have dubbed themselves "Conservatives," who would accept and preserve all the transformations, social and political, effected by the revolutionists, *baptizing* them, however, to render them beneficial instead of hurtful to Catholicism, Parliamentaryism furnishing the machinery for this marvellous work.

The sad truth, then, forces itself upon us, that, according to all human probability, a stable reconstruction of Europe seems at present hopeless. Hence the persuasion of many, which they consider to be founded on faith in the promises of God to His Church, that a tremendous and universal catastrophe is maturing itself in the Divine counsels. Such a catastrophe would overturn all existing things, and then God would once more take the world, now returned to worse than paganism, into His own hands to re-Christianize it, even as out

of the shattered fragments of the old Roman world, broken up by the eruption of the barbaric hordes, a new and beautiful order of Christian civilization was Divinely constituted. If this be but a conjecture, it seems one which, at least, is neither irrational nor extravagant.

FRENCH AND BELGIAN PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Paris: Juillet, 1879.

"**L**A BULLE *Unam Sanctam*" is the title of an Article by M. L'Abbé Mury, in which he endeavours to prove an assertion made by him a few years ago in his *Histoire Politique et Religieuse de la France*, that this famous Bull "was certainly falsified, if not entirely fabricated, as were so many others of that period, by creatures of the king of France." This assertion made in the *Histoire* with no other support than a reference to the learned Jesuit historian, Damberger, has provoked some sharp opposition and loud cries for proof. The Abbé brings forward his proofs in the present Article—the responsibility of which, by the way, the editor of the *Revue* places entirely with its author.

Tampering with Bulls and Briefs—altering, erasing, and even entirely rewriting—appears to have been frequent enough in the Middle Ages. At this particular time, Damberger says, there were "barefaced forgers" at the especial service of the French and Neapolitan kings; men who forged and altered without scruple. Thus the writer brings authorities to show that a former Bull of the same Boniface VIII., *Clericis laicos*, as it now exists, is either an altered version of the original, or a document entirely rewritten by royal creatures, after the original had been destroyed. Another Bull of the same Pontiff *Ausculda, fili* met a similar fate. Pierre Flotte circulated amongst the French people a false version of it, which so far worked on popular passions (as was intended) that the bishops begged the Pope to recall his summons of them to a Council at Rome "and not to break the union of the Church of France with the Throne." Héféle in his *History of the Councils* gives the text of this Bull *Ausculda, fili* (which he regards as authentic) "from an unerased, complete copy in the library of St. Victor," but M. Mury questions the authenticity of this copy, both (because of expressions in its text, because there is no evidence that this also is not "the work of the forgers who never ceased to irritate Philippe-le-Bel against the Pope," and because, lastly, as Héféle himself admits that the Count of Artois burnt the Bull, that the copies addressed to the clergy were suppressed, and that the piece kept in the Vatican was in great part erased: "whence," he asks "came the copy at St. Victor?" Besides, the Bull as it stands now, is, like others that were tampered with, too resonant of France even in diction and style, and too little like Rome and Boniface VIII. not to be *primò facie* suspicious.

A recent Article in the *Rivista Universale* and the *Analecta Juris pontificii*, supposed to be from the pen of Mgr. Chaillot, under the *nom de plume* of Prof. Vitali, maintains that because of the decretal *meruit* of

Clement V. which is equivalently a revocation of the Bull *unam sanctam*, because on the publication of the *Clementines* of John XXII. two years after the death of Philip and Clement the *unam sanctam* was not included (as it ought to have been if not revoked), and because the *extravagantes* in which it has a place was compiled "*sans critique*" and is not an official collection, the said Bull has the force only of a private document "of which each expression may be disputed—nay, the whole document!" M. Mury disputes it.

The objection that Leo X. confirmed the Bull *unam sanctam* in the Fifth Council of the Lateran, M. Mury considers the most serious one that can be brought against his view, but he disposes of it. That Pope confirmed it in a general way, but gave no text of the Bull he confirmed: where is the authentic text? So the question rests where it was before.

Finally, M. Mury contends that nothing in the Bull itself shows it to be of Boniface VIII. The compilers of the *corpus juris can.* placed at the head of the Bull: *Bonifacius VIII. (ann. 1302 Romæ)*, but it has to be shown that they were correct in doing so. Héféle has shown that a more precise date found on other copies, *XIV. kal. dec.* = 18 Nov. 1302, is very questionable, as that day was the feast of the dedication of the basilica of SS. Peter and Paul and the Roman Chancery would have expressed it. The first third part of the Bull, he says, is "altogether impersonal, dressed in oratorical forms, scarcely ever employed by the Pontifical Chancery," and insists chiefly on the *unity* of the Church which no one in France, not even the king, dreamed of denying. The remaining two-thirds are extracts from a compilation from S. Bernard and several other Saints, but with many disfigurements and exaggerations. At the very utmost, M. Mury thinks it may be a *projet de Bulle*. He goes into a long criticism of the text, especially of the peculiar interpretation of the "two swords," and of the expression *subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, &c.* So the Bull is apocryphal; and of neither canonical nor dogmatic value: it is not the work of Boniface VIII., but as M. Mury thinks, with Dr. Kraus (in the *Oesterreichische Vierteljahrschrift für Katholische Theologie* of January, 1862), it is the production of Ægidius Romanus, who was tutor to Philippe-le-Bel and afterwards Archbishop of Bourges. Dr. Kraus finds in an unpublished work of Ægidius "*de Ecclesiastica potestate libri III.*" several passages so like parts of the *unam sanctam* that he cannot resist the conviction that they are from the same pen. A few parallel sentences put together by Dr. Hergenröther, who is of the same opinion, are given in a note to the Article, and are indeed strikingly alike. The Bull was perhaps extracted from Ægidius' book, but, says M. Mury, not in *bonâ fide*. Philippe-le-Bel was angry with the Archbishop for going to the Council at Rome in spite of his prohibition, and it would be sure to exasperate him to see drawn from a work of that prelate a Bull which was attributed to Boniface VIII. Before the invention of printing it was as easy to fabricate official documents as to corrupt or suppress them. "The weakness of Clement V. which the Court of France so cruelly abused, makes doubt and suspicion easy of

all that remains of the Pontificate of Boniface VIII." The fact that Father Damberger (whose footsteps he here follows), devoted as he is to the Holy See, found it necessary in the interests of historical truth to reject as apocryphal this Bull so long regarded as authentic, becomes, M. Murj thinks, "a new proof of the necessity for the Holy See of entire and complete independence."

"UN Singulier Exemple de Critique Historique, M. Wohlwill et les Manuscrits de Galilée," is a short but noteworthy Article by M. Henri de l'Épinois. He had intended, he says, to write no more on the subject of Galileo—considering all he has already published and all that has been of late years written by able pens in almost every European country. The *pièces du procès*, preserved in the archives of the Vatican, were first made known to the public in this *Revue* (July, 1867) by M. de l'Épinois, and in 1877 were published in a complete form in France by the same *savant*; in Germany by Von Gebler. He is induced to break his resolution by a very curious incident. Dr. Emile Wohlwill in the *Historisch-literarische Abtheilung der Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* (t. xxiv. p. 1-26, 1878) has given publicity to a "discovery" of M. Gherardi, and has drawn therefrom certain conclusions "new, and even unforeseen," put forth, M. de l'Épinois earnestly contends, in good faith, but he adds, "also with singular courage."

Dr. Wohlwill publishes several detached sheets found in 1848 and 1849 by M. Gherardi in the archives of the Inquisition, which contain the decree of 16th June, 1633, wherein Urban VIII. orders Galileo to be examined and imprisoned if he is refractory. But there is a notable difference in the drawing up of these sheets. Four of them have been published; of these, two (numbered I. and II.) contain—or rather did contain—two separate orders; one to be followed in case Galileo should be ready to submit his judgments, and the other in the event of his obstinacy. And in these same two sheets the whole of the clause relative to the consequences of his obstinacy, after the introductory words, *et si attamen sustinuerit vel perstiterit*, to the extent of nearly two lines has been erased! In the other two published copies (numbered III. and IV.) no erasures have been made, but the unbroken text *omits* what has been crossed out from copies Nos. I. and II., together with the introduction of the clause, *si attamen*, as above; thus providing for only one contingency.

It is very natural to be curious as to whence these erasures and when they were made. There are nine of these detached sheets, and there were nine Cardinals in the Congregation for the examination of Galileo. Conjectures may easily be multiplied as to what purpose the sheets served. But if they were not finished decrees, but only rough draughts made at different periods before or at the examination, or if they were decrees modified afterwards by order of the Pope, how comes it that alterations have not been made by simple strokes of the pen across the phrases to be omitted? M. Gherardi has found that

similar erasures are often found in the place of "formal expressions," *i.e.*, expressions relating to ordinary procedures which are to be omitted in special cases, which would suggest an easy explanation, that the usual form of procedure had in this case been carefully set aside, as the Pope wished to confine the examiners to the *menace* of torture (*comminata ei tortura*), even if Galileo should persist in his opinions. But here M. Gherardi objects, and Dr. Wohlwill repeats the objection that the ink, paper, writing, wear (*l'usure*), all indicate that the two sheets with the erasures (Nos. I. and II.) are very ancient, whilst Nos. III. and IV., without any erasures, are as certainly recent productions. They believe that the former belong to the time of the trial, 1633, and that the latter were written ten or twenty years before 1848 (probably in 1835) for the Duke de Blacas; and, finally, that the erasures and alterations on the ancient sheets were made at the same date (1835), and are the work of the same hand.

M. de l'Epinois traces the history of the manuscript from 1814, when it came into the Duke de Blacas' hands, until, after his death in 1839 it was returned by his widow to Mgr. Altieri, the Nuncio at Vienna, and feels confident that it was never touched either by the Duke or by any one else with his cognizance, and that it was carefully kept. But if any "*pusillanime*, frightened by certain formulæ of the acts, and ignorant that the truth should always stand," has really tampered with the sheets, all Catholics as readily as others, from a love of truth, will be glad the imposture should be detected.

Dr. Wohlwill sees here an attempt, in our day, to frame a lying decree to replace one which we no longer dare to acknowledge. The erasures, he says, must have been either the order to use torture, or to conduct the victim into the torture chamber. He concludes that there has been a system of forgeries; that all the documents in the collection of the *pièces du procès* of Galileo preserved in the Vatican, which are contrary to the primitive version (*rédaction*) of the decree, are equally forgeries of the same period. M. de l'Epinois enumerates no less than eight important documents which thus become worse than useless.

Dr. Wohlwill's sweeping charge resolves itself into a question of pure paleography. And whilst M. de l'Epinois has not yet seen the pieces attacked, the authority of M. Gherardi as a paleograph does not stand high enough to peremptorily settle so grave an issue as this. M. de l'Epinois, accompanied by Dr. Wohlwill, have submitted a photograph of one of the suspected pieces to the judgment of M. Leopold Delisle, Director-General of the National Library, and his unhesitating judgment was that there was no trace of erasure of ancient writing, nor any difference in the writing of those passages supposed by M. Wohlwill to be a modern substitution.

But the opinion formed by the latter remains unchanged. M. de l'Epinois proposes that a jury be formed of competent paleographs, six to be chosen by himself, and six by M. Wohlwill—they are to be Germans, Italians, and Frenchmen. The character of the accused manuscripts is to be thoroughly examined by them at the Vatican and the question finally settled. "But," he concludes, "until expert paleographs shall have decided, I cannot induce myself to believe that the eight docu-

ments inserted in the collection of the Acts of the trial of Galileo are forgeries, and I must ask that until complete investigation has been made, they shall continue to be esteemed as genuine documents."

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

(By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.)

THE May, June, and July issues of the *Katholik* continue to discuss in very able Articles the doctrine of the essence and nature of bodies as taught by Duns Scotus, and to refute those Catholic divines who in our days claim that doctor as a patron of their atomistic theories. Besides Duns Scotus they also claim Durandus a S. Portiano, the *doctor resolutissimus*. It cannot be denied that Durandus has in many points a system of his own, since he rejects the *species intelligibilis* and the Thomistic principle of individuation, and declares against the doctrine of the *intellectus agens*. He, therefore, is a nominalist rather than a realist. But when we inquire into what Durandus teaches about the essence of bodies, we find him in harmony with S. Thomas. Like S. Thomas he considers the *materia prima* as a potency which is to be completed by the *form*, but this potency is not a mere nothing. Compared with the form it is only a possibility; compared with nothing, it is a real being. As to celestial bodies, however, Durandus holds that they are perfectly simple, not like the elements, but in the sense of not being composite. Only one substantial form is to be found in man, and this form is the human soul. Suarez, the leader of the new school of scholastics originated since the Reformation, is no more at variance with S. Thomas's doctrine about matter and form than Durandus. Faithfully following the mediæval doctors, Suarez teaches *materia prima*, which he takes to be one in all sublunary bodies; it is the subject of all changes in Nature. This matter must be completed by the form. S. Thomas defines it to be a mere potency without any act of essence or existence. Suarez, although assuming like S. Thomas *materia prima*, believes, on the contrary, that it cannot be conceived without these acts; nevertheless, he assigns these acts to the matter not as considered in itself, but only as destined to be pervaded and completed by a form. No real difference between S. Thomas and the *doctor eximius* can be detected, so that the result of this discussion may be summed up in the following propositions:— 1. All scholastic doctors teach the doctrine of matter and form; 2. All recognise the *materia prima* and *forma substantialis*, and the differences they allow of in defining them are of a subordinate character; 3. As to the capital question about the persistence of the elements in mixed bodies, they unanimously teach that the elements do not remain unaltered, but are to be found in the new body only *virtually*; 4. Whenever we find those doctors examining the questions as to the plurality of forms in man, we find that those who maintain such plurality protest also against any encroachment on the substantial unity of human nature. But what is to be thought of certain condemnations of some scholastic propositions amongst which we find also S. Thomas's doctrine

of substantial unity? Was not the angelic doctor severely attacked during his life on that account in Paris? Did not Robert Kilwardby and John Peckham, Archbishops of Canterbury, the former himself a Dominican, censure many of his propositions? As to the University of Paris it must be observed that we do not possess any historical monument which proves any such condemnation of S. Thomas. On the contrary it was the Parisian university, that great storehouse of learning during the Middle Ages, which, after the death of S. Thomas, sent to the Dominican Fathers united in their chapter that famous letter which eulogised the deceased doctor in the highest terms, declaring that the sun of truth had ceased to shed its light when Thomas died.

Cardinal Figliara has lately in his book, "*De mente Concilii Viennensis*," examined the so-called condemnations passed on S. Thomas (as our adversaries contend), and he clearly demonstrates that they do not touch S. Thomas, but only condemn the system of Averroes, whose errors just at that time were about to find their way into the Catholic schools. That the English condemnations were not in any way an obstacle to the adoption of S. Thomas's doctrine may further be gathered from the solemn fact that the general chapter of the Augustinians, convened in 1287, commanded all its professors and students strictly to follow Ægidius Colonna, formerly general of the Order and afterwards Cardinal-Archbishop of Bourges, one of the most brilliant disciples of the Doctor Angelicus. Lastly, our author at greater length comments on the well-known decision of the Council of Vienne which condemned the errors of John of Oliva. Fresh light has been poured on the case of Oliva by Dr. Ucelli who picked up in the Borghese Library in Rome Oliva's "*Quæstiones quodlibetales*," from which we may infer as beyond any doubt two points: 1. John of Oliva did not maintain the multiplicity of souls; 2. His error was rather about the *mode of union* between soul and body. Whilst the Catholic schools taught that the soul was by herself and immediately the vivifying principle of the body, John of Oliva declared it was only by her sensitive part that she was united with the body. But the obvious sense of the Council's decision does not exclude the fact that it also condemned dualism. The author of this learned contribution is the Rev. N. Schneid, Professor of Philosophy in the Seminary of Eichstadt, Bavaria, who some years ago published two other works on mediæval philosophy, "*Matter and Form*" and "*Aristotle in the Scholastic System*," and who, with Canons Dr. Stöckl and Dr. Morgott, of Eichstadt, ranks foremost among those Catholic divines in Germany to whom we are deeply indebted for their unceasing exertions in restoring the old Catholic philosophy, and opposing the prevailing system of atomism. In the same Number of the *Katholik* we find an exposition of Cardinal Deschamp's pamphlet on "*Modern Constitutions*," and the nature of the oath taken by Catholic subjects. In order to conciliate the Catholic parties in Belgium and to soothe passions excited by some ultras, the eminent author unanswerably shows from the origin and nature of the "*Charte*," that Catholics, without encroaching in any way on the principles of faith and the pontifical

syllabus, may take the oath, and are in conscience bound faithfully to keep it. In doing so they mean not to uphold heresy, but only to oblige themselves to grant to those outside the Church a mere civil toleration and protection. Hence the *Civiltà Cattolica* appropriately remarks: "Never has the Holy Father in his encyclicals rejected constitutions or their adherents, but his letters and the syllabus have only warned the faithful against the liberal doctrines which are the source of scepticism and naturalism."

The July issue of the *Katholik* gives us the first part of "Studies on the Emancipation of the Catholics in Great Britain." We are made acquainted with the first instalments of justice from the British Government to its Catholic subjects. Unfortunately a very troublesome party amongst the Catholics themselves, headed by Mr. C. Butler, through disobedience towards the Vicars Apostolic, threatened to overthrow the work of emancipation.

2. In the *Historisch-politische Blätter* we have an able Article headed "From Stabiæ to Paestum." We suppose it to be generally known that the Benedictine Fathers formerly residing in Beuron, a convent in Hohenzollern, and who, in consequence of the May Laws, were expelled from their property, were distinguished not only by their successful efforts in cultivating the Gregorian chant, but worked energetically at reviving the old traditions of their Order in painting. Driven out of their country, some of them proceeded to Monte Cassino, the cradle of their Order, where they are now actively employed in decorating with frescoes the church and the venerable monastery. They hope that in 1880, when St. Benedict's centenary is to be celebrated, the great work will be happily finished. Two members of this artist colony describe in the above-mentioned Article the ruins of Paestum, and especially the three great temples dedicated to Poseidon and Dimeter. As a record of the centenary of St. Benedict, we may also consider Cardinal Bartolini's very learned work, "*Di San Zaccaria papa e degli anni del suo Pontificato*," on which I commented in two Articles in the August issue. S. Zacharias reigned only ten years (741-751); but from the sanctity of his life, the firmness and mildness of his character, the variety of his learning and his remarkable labours for the Church in Italy, Germany, and England, he ranks amongst the greatest successors of S. Peter. He belongs to those Popes who founded the Temporal Power. He also vindicated it against the invasions of the Lombards. He assigned to S. Boniface a fixed See at Mayence, and elevated Pepin to the French throne. It was at his suggestion that S. Boniface sent a famous letter to Ethelbald, King of England, and that the same great Bishop forwarded two letters to the English clergy prescribing a reformation of the discipline, at the synod of Cloveshoe. Cardinal Bartolini opens his work with a "*ragionamento preliminare*," discussing the beginning of the temporal dominion of the Holy See, which took no step by the way of usurpation or revolution, but became possessor by the most sacred titles that can be conceived—donations and the free submission of the Italian population, who in vain asked the Byzantine Court defence and protection.

The introduction is followed by ten "commentaries," according to the years of the Pope's reign. We become acquainted with S. Zacharias as a great Pontiff, a father of the poor, a man of science and art. Descended from Greek parents in Southern Italy he came to Rome, and was educated with the Benedictines in the patriarchal basilica of the Lateran. A perfect master of Greek, after his promotion to the See of S. Peter, he translated the dialogues of S. Gregory into that tongue, solemnly consecrated the great Abbey of Monte Cassino, reconstructed by Abbot Petronax, and spent immense sums of money in the restoration of the Roman Churches. Cardinal Newman's title, S. Giorgio in Velabro, that venerable small Basilica near the forum Boarium, is intimately connected with the name of Pope Zacharias. It was he who, having found one day amongst the other precious relics preserved in the Lateran, the head of S. George (with the pictacium or epitaphium), carried it in solemn procession to the aforesaid basilica, to which he appointed Greek monks for the celebration of the divine offices. Most appropriately Cardinal Bartolini presents us with a photograph of an illumination in gothic style from the precious manuscript *codex* belonging to S. Peter's, painted at the command of Cardinal de Stefaneschi by the immortal Giotto. An appendix gives the documents quoted in the text. The issues of July 16, and August 1, furnish Articles on the year in which S. Ignatius of Antioch was put to death. The Rev. Dr. Nirschl, Professor in the Lyceum of Passau, Bavaria, clearly refutes the objections made by a Protestant critic against the holy bishops being martyred in 107. The critic urged that it was not in that year that the Emperor Trajan proceeded to the East to fight against the Parthians, and therefore he could not have condemned S. Ignatius, at Antioch, to be devoured by lions in Rome. Hence the acts of S. Ignatius's martyrdom are called adulterated and the production of a later period. Even Catholic divines have been led to adopt this opinion. Dr. Nirschl, with unanswerable reasons, justifies the old tradition, because: 1. The author of the acts of the martyrdom was an eye-witness; 2. We have an official letter of another contemporary, the imperial prefect of Palestine, Tiberianus, who wrote about the matter to Trajan; 3. The *Chronicon Pascale*; and 4. De Rossi (*Inscriptiones Christianæ urbis Romæ*, I., p. 10); 5. Cureton (*Corpus Ignat.* p. 252) prove that S. Ignatius suffered in 107; 6. The ancient fathers, principally S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom, styled Ignatius disciple of the apostles and principally of St. John.

Another elaborate treatise expatiates on the *art of illuminating* during the Middle Ages. As to Ireland, the author writes: "When art and artists were driven away from the East, when they were not allowed in the West a resting-place for their feet, they took refuge in the far Erin, and it was in that island that art, in a new fantastic youth, inaugurated a new period. The great Irish convents of the sixth and seventh centuries not only sent out their missionaries to Germany—peregrinare pro Christo—but also laboured strenuously in promoting art, by illuminating and ornamenting manuscripts." He refers to the "Gospels" of Durrow and Kells, the psalter of Finnan, and the antiphony of Bangor.

3. The *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*. In the May issue Father Knabenbauer continues to discuss the sources of unbelief, pointing to negligence in practising the faith, the striving after and enjoying the goods of this world, pride and sensuality, and especially the unceasing efforts of Satan who ruined by unbelief our first parents. Father Thil brings to an end his able Paper on Spellman's well-known work. He sets forth the principles which the Holy See professes whenever it enters on solemn concordats with secular Governments which had sacrilegiously appropriated the Church's property. The Popes never failed to consider the so-called secularizations as acts null and void, deprived of any effect towards the Church; on the contrary, they always claimed for themselves as representatives of the Church the independent right of disposal of those goods. The encroachments of Governments and Parliaments since the great Revolutions in France, Germany, Spain, and in our own days in Italy, plainly show the importance of those theses of the syllabus which reject modern theories transferring Church property to the State. In the July issue we meet with Father Bauer, an old contributor to this periodical, who takes up again the subjects of the French Church and Jansenism. A long series of facts cleverly linked together by the author is put before us, in order to give us an insight into the endeavours of the French Parliaments to influence the Church and to rescue it from so-called tyranny of the bishops of the Apostolic See. Those petulant and conceited Jansenist Parliaments have done as much as the "philosophers" themselves to undermine Church and altar and then to upset entire society. Father Pesch continues to discuss the "Christian State and Modern State Theories," by examining the systems of Fichte and Hegel. Both of them develop Kant's theories, and Hegel was so happy as to launch into the world the great word, "The State is the omnipresent God." These systems have, unfortunately, succeeded in destroying the faith in thousands of people, in weakening the idea and sense of justice, and in damaging the most sacred interest of the Church. Two elaborate Papers on the "Geological Determination of the Antiquity of Man" are contributed by F. von Hummelauer; and Father Baumgartner at greater length comments on Professor Jannsen of Frankfort's, excellent work, "The History of the German People since the end of the Middle Ages."

4. The *Literarische Rundschau* in Nos. 9 and 10 has reviews on the recent works on the nature of bodies by Dr. Schneid; on Pelesz's "History of the Union of the Ruthenian Church with Rome" by Cardinal Hergenröther; and on the most valuable fundamental theology of Professor Hettinger, of Würzburg, by Dr. Kraus.

Notices of Books.

Die Lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen vor Hieronymus und die Itala des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der heiligen Schrift. Von L. ZIEGLER. München: Th. Riedel, 1879. (*The Latin Translations of the Bible, previous to Jerome, and the Itala of Augustine.* A Contribution to the History of the Holy Scriptures. By L. ZIEGLER.)

AN immense amount of learned labour has been spent upon the Latin version or versions of Holy Scripture current in the Church before the translation of S. Jerome obtained, first, universal acceptance, and then authoritative recognition. In the last century the great Benedictine scholar, Sabatier, and the Roman oratorian, Bianchini, laid the foundation for all subsequent investigation; and in modern times the interest in this special subject has grown with the growth of the general interest in the textual criticism of the New Testament. Vercellone, Ranke, and many others have edited fragments of old Latin versions. A multitude of scholars, among whom our own Cardinal Wiseman deserves particular mention, have discussed the history and origin of the old Latin version. Tischendorf, and indeed all recent editors of the New Testament, have availed themselves of the results thus obtained and have used the fragments of the old Latin Bible as an important aid in ascertaining the original text of the Greek New Testament. Yet, after all, much remains to be done. There are still MSS. to edit and in all probability to discover. Patristic citations still require sifting and collecting. But, besides all this, the student feels the need of some book which will put him in possession of results already gained—of some book which may serve to mark out the ground and enable him to distinguish what is certain from what is either mere conjecture or at best more or less probable. Ziegler's work has done a great deal to supply this desideratum. It throws clear light on matters which have hitherto appeared most perplexed. And we cannot do better than set before our readers a brief analysis of its contents.

The *locus classicus* on the old Latin Bible is the following well-known passage in the *De Doctrina Christiana* of S. Augustine:—

“Qui scripturas ex Hebraica lingua in Græcam verterunt, numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo; ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari.” A little further on in the same work, the Saint continues: “In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.”—*De Doct. Christ. II., 11 and II. 15.*

We will take these words as our starting-point, and consider three questions which spring naturally from them. The reader will see,

before we conclude, that to answer them is to state all we know at present on the old Latin Bible. The questions are: 1. Were there several, or was there only one, Latin version of the Bible circulated in the Church before S. Jerome's day? 2. What does S. Augustine mean by the *Interpretatio Itala* or *Italic* version? 3. Are there any fragments of this version which still remain and which may be recognised?

We have given our judgment on Ziegler's book when we say that on the first and most important question he gives a decided answer, and almost, as it seems to us, demonstrates the truth of his theory; while on the other two he puts forward theories which are at least sustained with patient learning and great ingenuity. Let us take the questions in order:—

1. The first question seems to answer itself, but in reality it has been a matter of the keenest contention among scholars. At the first glance the words of S. Augustine appear plain and decided. He tells us there had been a multitude of "interpreters" who "turned" the Bible from Greek into Latin. However, a number of eminent critics (Eichhorn, Wiseman, Reuss, and others) maintain that even according to S. Augustine there was but one Latin version current before that of S. Jerome; that this version underwent various revisions (this is the sense they give to "interpretari"); and that, among the revisions, the "Italic" was, in S. Augustine's opinion, to be preferred. Ziegler, on the other hand, argues for a multitude of Prehieronymian versions, and we think, as we have already said, that he has demonstrated his case.

His chief arguments are these. He shows that *interpretari* in S. Augustine means—to "translate," neither more nor less. He confirms the testimony of S. Augustine by citations to the same effect from other Fathers, *e.g.*, from Tertullian, Fulgentius of Ruspa, and Primasius of Utica. He disposes of objections which have been raised from the use of phrases like "*vulgata editio*," "*vetus translatio*," which are found in S. Jerome and S. Gregory the Great, and which seem to point to a single old Latin version, by showing that such phrases sometimes refer to the Greek Septuagint and are sometimes used collectively for the old Latin version as contrasted with the new translation of S. Jerome. Next, Ziegler examines the Biblical quotations in the Latin Fathers, and shows that they must have had different translations before them. This part of the work is done with great care and moderation. Lastly, Ziegler takes up the Prehieronymian versions still existing in MSS., two of which at least belong to the fourth and fifth centuries, in order to make it evident that they contain independent versions, not revisions of the same version. Of course the cogency of this proof depends upon an accumulation of instances, for which we must refer the reader to the work itself.

2. We may therefore assume the existence of several old Latin versions. But what does S. Augustine mean by giving the name of "*Itala*" to that one among them all which he prefers? Some have followed Cardinal Wiseman in his supposition that the version in question was an Italian revision of a translation which was made in Africa. This theory rests chiefly on the alleged fact that the fragments

of Preheronymian translations are marked by so-called "Africanisms"—*i.e.*, by peculiarities of diction common to the authors in North Africa who write Latin. Ziegler makes this supposed fact very doubtful. Apart from this, such an argument assumes the unity of Preheronymian versions, a unity which has to be proved, and which, in Ziegler's opinion, is incapable of proof. Rönsch takes "Itala" in the sense of vulgar or popular Latin, as equivalent, in short, to the "lingua Rustica;" but no valid instances can be adduced for such a sense of the word "Italus." Ziegler himself adopts the plain and obvious solution. He understands by the "Italic" version, one which was made in Italy.

3. This leads us, by an easy transition, to the third and last question—Are there any traces left of this Italian version? After long investigation, Ziegler professes to find a remarkable and singular resemblance in the Biblical quotations of certain Italian Fathers (*e.g.*, S. Ambrose and Rufinus), in those of S. Augustine, in the present Vulgate text of the Latin New Testament, and in the text contained in an MS. of the fifth or sixth century, now at Munich, which contains fragments of the Pauline Epistles, known as the Freising Fragments of the Itala. Ziegler explains the resemblance which runs through all these authorities for the old Latin text, as follows:—He supposes that the Italian Fathers used chiefly this Italic version; that S. Augustine learned to know it at the time of his conversion, and took it with him to Africa; that S. Jerome made it the basis of his Latin New Testament, which we know to have been merely a revision of a previous text; and that the Freising Fragments are parts of a MS. which contained this Italic version entire. When all is said, this is a mere hypothesis, but an hypothesis ingenious in itself, and most ingeniously supported. Some day or other it may be fully verified.

We would fain have lingered over many points of interest incidentally raised in this able treatise. Even young students in Biblical criticism gain much if they patiently follow discussions of this kind. By pursuing such detailed inquiries they see things with a vivid reality, which is far preferable to the vague impression which they get from Biblical "Introductions;" facts impress themselves upon their memory, and, what is most important, they become accustomed to the true method of critical investigation. It is worth while, as an exercise of mind, to follow a writer such as Ziegler, whether we agree or disagree with his conclusions.

Summa Theologica S. Thomæ, Doctoris Angelici, uno Schemate exhibita. Rome: Propaganda Press. 1878.

THERE is nothing new in the idea of tabulating the Summa. The *Petite Somme* of Lebrethon contains tables of each part and of each treatise. But this bird's-eye view of the whole Summa on one sheet has a character of its own, and exhibits very clearly and completely the vast materials and the lucid order of the Angelic Doctor's master-

piece. A student who has made a careful survey of the Schema will generally be able to lay his finger on any question without consulting an index. It will prove very useful in theological libraries and lecture-rooms, both to professors and to auditors.

L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican. Par EMILE OLLIVIER.
Paris : Garnier frères. 1879.

THE title of this book by no means tells the reader what it really is. M. Emile Ollivier, who has been living in retirement since the misfortunes which so abruptly terminated his tenure of office nine years ago, has here undertaken to give the world his whole theory on the relations of France and her modern ideas with the Papacy and the Catholic religion. His two volumes are of extreme interest, although not always either sound or trustworthy. They abound in graphic sketches of events, and skilful portraits of men. They display much apparent love for Catholicism, and respect for the Holy See. They uniformly condemn Socialism, Atheism, and revolutionary excess. And, at the same time, they are the production of a most thoroughly "liberal" Frenchman.

M. Ollivier attributes the present religious crisis in France to two causes: first, the nervousness and anxiety of Catholics about the position of the Holy Father; and, secondly, the fiery ultramontane spirit of the French clergy. As to the first, he has very little advice to give. He is against all foreign interference in favour of the Pope. He would leave his cause to Italy herself. As soon as she finds she is not bound by honour to keep up the Holy Father's imprisonment, she will have her eyes opened by the events which are sure to take place in Rome, and she herself will cure the evil she has done.

The Italian, even when he loses his faith, keeps his superstition. The noisiest sceptic is by no means sure there is not a hell; *chi lo sa?* he must be prepared for whatever may happen. The fieriest enemies of the Papacy are confessed and anointed at the last moment, and die covered with scapulars and rosaries. One of Cavour's anxieties, when he began the contest with Rome, was to make sure of the Capuchin who absolved him; Victor Emmanuel would not die a heretic; and I am not at all sure that Garibaldi—if they allow a priest to come to his dying bed—will not behave to him as he has behaved to the "million" which he so long declined, and end by accepting the favours of Holy Church. A nation such as this will never let the Papacy perish—the Papacy which belongs to Italy more than to any other people; and if strangers keep away from interfering, the Italians will free the Papacy.—Vol. iv. p. 514.

As for France and her ultramontane clergy, M. Ollivier is of opinion that what France requires is the restoration of the Canon law, more especially in regard to the irremovability of the parish priests, and the establishment of diocesan "courts" for the decision of ecclesiastical causes. He makes out that the clergy are terrorized by the bishops. The bishops, he admits, are wise men and holy; but they are men; and what is wanted is not *arbitrium* but law. A great

deal of this kind of talk has been going on for the last twenty years. A *brochure* which made some noise in Paris last year—*Pourquoi le clergé Français est ultramontain*—details at great length the reforms which are needed in order to satisfy the French clergy. Speaking of Abbé Bougaud's book on the diminution of clerical vocations, it says :—

The real reason why sacerdotal vocations decrease in number is, that the priests have no security for their person, their dignity, their position, as against arbitrary practice and abuse of power on the part of the Bishops. Pp. 37.

It is true, no doubt, that in the Church of France the parish priests are removable at the pleasure of the diocesan bishops; and also that mistakes, not to say abuses, may and do occur, and that more than one case of real hardship may be found out by any one who carefully explores the records of such a large body of men as the clergy of France during the last quarter of a century. But it is a very great error to suppose either that these hardships and abuses are very common, or that the bishops are not fully alive to their possibility. As long ago as 1849 the Provincial Council of Avignon laid down the law of the matter. The present discipline, it declared, although different from that which had flourished for many centuries in the Church, was in no way contrary either to the spirit of the Church or to the nature of the ecclesiastical ministry; in fact, it had really existed both in the early ages and at various times since. It blames in strong terms, therefore, those who had stirred up strife on the subject in the province, and reminds all that the matter has been expressly reserved to the more mature judgment of the Holy See.* “But,” said the Council of Avignon, “considering the fatherly love of a bishop towards his fellow-workmen in the ministry, let no one, *ordinarily*, be removed from his parish against his will without an investigation by the diocesan court, or the advice of the bishop's private council.” The Councils of Rheims (1849), Tours (1850), Bordeaux (1850), and Puy (1850), speak in the same sense; reminding the bishops, moreover, that this power must be used “prudently, paternally, and rarely.” And the Council of Rheims resolved to take steps to have at least three or four parish priests in each “Canton,” besides the dean, constituted perpetual rectors and irremovable. The reason for this discipline is not far to seek. A body of clergy who cannot be removed without formal and public process is at all times a serious matter for any Church which regards heresy and immorality in a pastor as the worst evil that can befall a Christian flock. But, whatever the normal danger, it becomes vastly increased when the very courts which ought to try such a pastor are hampered by an atheistical or “liberal” government, and by a reckless public press. The existence of freeholds and vested right requires the existence of stable law and unfettered courts. But, thanks to perpetual revo-

* Gregory XVI. answered the bishop of Liege, 1 May. 1845, that “no change was to be made on this point of discipline until the Holy See should decide otherwise.”

lution, no stable Canon law has been possible in France during this century, and even bishops have been barely tolerated, let alone bishops' courts. In times of crisis the executive must take absolute powers.

There are not wanting signs that the French Episcopate are anxious to give the clergy every security they can wish for. M. Ollivier himself quotes the letters of Cardinal Caterini (17 January, 1876), praising the Council of Puy (1873) for establishing diocesan courts (*officialités*) and the concursus in the collation of parishes. Other steps would soon be taken if the governments would let the bishops alone. Meanwhile one cannot help distrusting M. Ollivier in the matter. His object, clearly enough, is to separate the clergy from the Holy See by making them freeholders of their parishes under the sanction of the French law. Does he not see, that if the Holy See hesitates to urge the restoration of the old discipline, it is not because it likes the bishops to be autocrats, but because it fears to hand over both *curés* and flocks to that very uncertain expression, the French Government?

We have not dwelt on M. Ollivier's strange theology, and curious Church history. These, perhaps, will not do much harm; they are too evidently the production of an *amateur*. The lively writing, the bits of new gossip, and the useful testimony against the ultra-Republicans, which these volumes contain, will make them interesting to readers who know what to reject.

The Life of John Wilson, D.D., F.R.S. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D.
London: Murray. 1878.

South Africa and its Mission Fields. By the Rev. J. E. CARLYLE.
London: James Nisbet and Co. 1878.

WE have here two volumes of Protestant missionary literature, differing widely, however, from one another in subject and in interest. Dr. John Wilson was not only a missionary, but a scholar and a philanthropist. His influence at Bombay for over fifty years was uniformly exerted in the best interests of the native race among whom he lived, and Europeans, up to the Governor himself, acknowledged him as the most able and trustworthy of advisers. We cannot, of course, speak with any sympathy of his mission-work proper; but the miserable insufficiency of Protestantism was his misfortune more than his choice; he knew nothing higher. The present *Life*, written by one who knew him well, is full of ample and indispensable details of the condition and future prospects of the native races of India and of their religion. Mr. Carlyle's book, on the other hand, is a mere compilation by one who has been at the Cape, it is true, but who writes rather from the information furnished by others than from his own observation. From a literary point of view the work is fair, though not excellent; but the author fails to give anything like a life-like picture of even the Protestant missions in South Africa; whilst as to the Catholic Church he says, in effect, that he knows nothing about it,

and virtually passes it over. Still, the sketch he presents is not without interest, and will be read with unusual curiosity at the present moment.

Mixed Essays. By MATTHEW ARNOLD. London : Smith, Elder and Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1879.

THIS volume consists of nine essays which have all appeared before. Three of them may be termed political, and the rest literary and critical. The first Essay, on Democracy, was published nearly twenty years ago, as preface to a work on Continental Schools; the others have appeared in various well-known Reviews.

The Essay on "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" is particularly interesting at the present moment. Mr. Arnold shows how powerful and overwhelming a claim Ireland has to a Catholic University with the same privileges as Oxford and Cambridge. Unless this claim is granted, we need not wonder, he says, at Ireland's antipathy to us. We may quite expect in an essay that touches on the Catholic Church to have some of Mr. Arnold's peculiar religious views; but we also find here many expressions of his high admiration for the Church. He may consider Catholicism that "form of Christianity which is fullest of human accretions and superstitions," yet this is so "because it is the oldest, the largest, the most popular." "It is the religion which has most reached the people." He persists in thinking that Catholicism has a great future before it; that it will endure while all the Protestant sects (not including the Church of England) will dissolve and perish. But, strange to say, it is the Church's charm for the imagination, its *poetry*, that is to be the secret of its strength and vitality. The Catholic Church is to be the Church of the future, but a Church purified from the dross of "superannuated dogma," a Church refined and criticised and sublimated, finally, into a piece of *poetry*.

The Essay entitled "Porro unum est necessarium" is dedicated to showing the general superiority of education in France to that in England. Our great deficiency is in the almost total want of "secondary schools." Whilst in Great Britain and Ireland there are not more than 20,000 boys receiving an efficient secondary instruction, there are in France more than 140,000 receiving such instruction.

In the literary Essays of this collection, Mr. Arnold is most enjoyable. We do not say we always agree with him. But there is a keenness of criticism, a freshness and originality, and a scholarly refinement in these Essays, that make such writing a real treat. In consideration of these qualities, we pardon Mr. Arnold's superciliousness and eccentricities of taste. We are glad to see these Essays reprinted in their present form.

The Life of Bishop Fisher, &c. By AGNES STEWART. London : Burns & Oates. 1879.

TO compose a life of a great ecclesiastical writer like Fisher, without any knowledge of his writings, whether in Latin or in English, is

certainly a bold feat. It has, however, been undertaken by Miss Stewart—with the success that might have been expected. Had the authoress been content with reprinting the old life by Dr. Bailey with the embellishment of her present work in the portraits of the holy martyr, of his royal client, Katharine of Arragon, and his royal patroness Margaret, Countess of Richmond, we should have been grateful; and still more so had she collated the various MSS. of Dr. Hall, and thus given us a correct edition of the original life which Bailey used. But the present compilation not only adds nothing to our previous knowledge of Fisher; it is calculated to mislead and perplex those who have recourse to it. We must justify these censures as far as space permits. There is a chapter with the somewhat patronising title, “On the Bishop’s Literary Attainments;” but even the small amount of information in this is merely abridged from Lewis. Even the list of his works is incorrect. We find “The Fruitful Sayings of David, London, October, 1555, translated from the Latin,” and “Sermon on the Passion, translated.” Was it too much to expect that a writer of Fisher’s life would consult the recent collection of his English works, published by the Early English Text Society? Had Miss Stewart done so she would have found that Fisher’s sermons on the Penitential Psalms and on the Passion were preached and published in English, the former in 1509. They were only translated *into* Latin by John Fenn, in the reign of Elizabeth. Again, more than forty pages of the appendix are devoted to a reprint of Fisher’s funeral sermons on Henry VII. and his mother, Lady Margaret. In these the original spelling is half-preserved and half-modernized in a manner utterly incoherent and irrational, and the sermon on Lady Margaret is abridged by uniting and omitting sentences without any warning to the reader. Again, at p. 216, in the list of works we find “Sermon at the Burning of Luther’s Works, Cambridge, 1521.” Well, a Latin translation by Richard Pace was published at Cambridge, but the original English sermon was printed by Wynkyn de Worde in London. But at p. 20 we are told that this famous sermon (printed in 1521) was preached on Quinquagesima Sunday, 1525, and we are referred in the note to Lingard, who certainly makes no such blunder. The slightest reference to the original, or to the reprint, or to histories of the time, would have given the correct date—viz., Octave of the Ascension, 1521. We are told (p. 16) that in 1518 Fisher was elected Master of Queen’s College, Cambridge. The proper date is 1505. But more strange still, we read on the same page that “in the year 1518 Fisher lost his good and amiable patroness, for the Lady Margaret died in the July of that year.” She died on 29th June, 1509; and as this is one of the principal epochs of Fisher’s life, and affects the whole history of the foundation of Christ’s and St. John’s Colleges, the mistake throws the whole chronology into utter confusion. We are then certainly justified in complaining that Miss Stewart has not let Bailey tell the story of Fisher’s life, without interpolating into his narrative ill-arranged patches from Lingard, Audin, and Strickland, and sprinkling it with erroneous dates. She has “rent the new garment, and the piece taken from the new agreeth not with the old.” Those who care

nothing for dates and historical accuracy may find much to interest them in this book, because by far the greater part is a transcript of an old book. This is referred to throughout as "Hall's Life of Fisher." But if further evidence can be wanted of the unpardonable carelessness of the compilation, it may be found in the use made of this old volume. Miss Stewart gives no account of Dr. Hall, to enable us to judge what authority we may attach to his narrative, and even with regard to the book which she quotes so copiously, she herself possesses no correct knowledge. In her prospectus she says that "she has quoted mainly from Dr. Richard Hall, of Douay, whose work was reprinted under the name of Dr. Bailey, in 1740, and is now rarely to be met with." At p. 210 she speaks of "the far-off days of 1640, in which Dr. Hall wrote his now very rare work." Again, at p. 4, she refers to "Dr. Hall, of Douay, 1655." We should gather from this that the work was written by Hall in 1640, published in his name in 1655, and republished in Dr. Bailey's name in 1740. Yet, at p. 12 of the Introduction, we learn that "Dr. Hall died in 1604, leaving the life of the Bishop in MS." This is correct. How then can he have written the book in 1640, thirty-six years after his death? The note goes on to say that "copies were afterwards printed from it" (*i.e.*, from Hall's MS.), "one of which fell into the hands of Thomas Bailey, who sold it to a bookseller, and publicly called himself the author;" and we are referred to A. Wood and Todd's *Life of Cranmer*. Now Anthony à Wood is so far from saying that a *printed* copy of Hall fell into Bailey's hands that he gives the detailed history of the MS. used by Bailey, and published by him for the first time, but with alterations. It is then Bailey's Hall which is quoted by Miss Stewart as the very rare work. Bailey's work cannot be said to be very scarce, since, besides the original edition of 1655, there were two reprints in London in 1739, another in Dublin in 1740, and a still more recent one in 1835. Evidently, Miss Stewart has miscalculated her powers in attempting historical biography, and we trust that she will take counsel before carrying out her intention of writing the life of Cardinal Pole, as she has announced. When Protestant ladies are writing with much care and grace of style the lives of Catholic saints, we cannot allow a Catholic lady to treat our Fishers, Mores, Wolseys, and Poles in this slovenly way without a protest. Good intentions cannot compensate for incompetence or carelessness.

The Early History of the Christian Church during the First Ten Centuries. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A. London: John Murray. 1878.

OBVIOUSLY the first thing to be expected of a man who sits down to write a Manual of Church History is an account of what he understands the Church to be. Mr. Smith has not neglected this preliminary. He has devoted an Introduction of ten pages to it. He begins by quoting the singular article of the Church of England which affirms that "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the

Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." This is the thesis with which he starts, and he develops it in strict accordance with the canon of composition—

Qualis ab incepto talis servetur ad imum;

the conclusion at which he arrives being that there exists "an impossibility of distinguishing the true Church, by any certain and infallible test, from the various societies which have borne the name."—P. 9.

So much may suffice to indicate Mr. Smith's point of view, and to relieve us from the necessity of criticising in detail his performance. His dates are generally right; and he does not, as a rule, state inaccurately the bare facts with which he has to deal. But let no student who seeks to apprehend truly what the Ancient Church was expect any real assistance from these pages.

Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, being Selections, Personal, Historical, Philosophical, and Religious, from his various Works. Arranged by WILLIAM SAMUEL LILLY, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law; with the Author's approval. Fourth Edition. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

WE are glad to see that this work has passed into a Fourth Edition. Mr. Lilly, in his Preface, gives the following account of the scope of it. "In the following pages I have endeavoured to give an account, through extracts, from [Cardinal Newman's] books of his present views on the chief matters of general interest, on which he has written from time to time. I have sought especially to present his mind on the great religious questions which have so largely exercised the intellect of this age." (Pref. p. viii.) It was Mr. Lilly's privilege to execute his compilation with no inconsiderable amount of assistance from Cardinal Newman, who has expressly sanctioned the statement that it correctly represents his present opinions. (Ib. p. x.) We observe that no alteration has been made in the work since the First Edition. We would suggest to the compiler whether there are not passages in the Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, and in the notes and preface to the New Edition of the "*Via Media*," which might well be inserted, and which would make the sketch of Cardinal Newman's teaching more complete.

A Victim of the Falk Laws. London: Bentley and Son. 1879.

THIS narrative of the adventures of a German priest in prison and in exile has been received with the greatest interest, and not only has the original, in spite of official suppression, gone through nine editions in Germany, but we understand that the English translation now before us has met with the greatest success in England. It is an artless and straightforward account of the persecution that befell a

young parish priest who was appointed after the passing of the Laws of May, 1873. The writer succeeds in giving a very distinct portrait of himself, although not aware, perhaps, how far he has succeeded in this. Fresh from his seminary, he is young, strong, brimful of zeal, and not unwilling to display his classical culture and his powers of discussion. He has a vein of German tenderness, and a tincture of German humour—the former somewhat sentimental, the latter rather thin. He has a good appetite, and it is small blame to him that he describes his occasional “good meals,” after a few months of prison or a ten-mile walk at night, with an unction which recalls Wilhelm Meister himself. And it would be amusing to count the number of times he speaks with fondness of a weed commonly supposed to be barely tolerated to clerics. The picture furnished by this narrative of the prison life of a German priest proves most undeniably that the talk about “cheap martyrdom” is utterly ridiculous. It is a very real and very painful experience. The priest’s cell at Treves was six or seven feet by four, and just high enough to stand up in. The strongly barred window could be opened a hand-breadth, and no more. The furniture consisted of a table, two stools, two or three utensils, an old curtain over a slight recess, and a bed. The bed could only be classed among beds *reductivé*, as logicians would say, for some of the essentials of a bed were certainly wanting. It consisted of trestles on which was laid a sack tightly stuffed with straw, the whole bearing some resemblance to a vertical section of the trunk of a tree, and so short that the sleeper had to form what railway people call an S curve in order to accommodate himself to it. “The bag was as hardened as the prisoner,” and the two rags, stuffed also with straw, which did duty as pillows, completed a luxurious apparatus, from which the unaccustomed sleeper kept rolling on to the plaster floor all the night through. At five o’clock in the morning the ringing of bells and the crash of keys and doors awoke those who were not already awake and sore with bumps and bruises. There was work till seven and then came breakfast, which consisted of thin broth in a wooden skillet such as is used to feed dogs. At half-past eleven they dined on what the writer (or translator) calls a *squash* of boiled pease or potatoes, served in large buckets, each prisoner advancing plate in hand and taking a portion. For supper, at six, they had a watery decoction which the translator, despairing of finding another word sufficiently mimetic, leaves under its most suggestive native name of *schlicht*. Daily after dinner they had to perform the exercise called the *goose’s march*, that is, to walk slowly round the court at a distance of five feet from one another. “If we had but little to digest,” says the author, “we could at least breathe fresh air.” They seem to have been allowed, although not at first, to relieve the intolerable tedium of what the translator, somewhat grotesquely, calls “cellular” life, by study and reading. The author endured an imprisonment of four months. Afterwards he was banished, first from his province, and then from Germany. How he clung to his faithful people, and how touchingly they clung to him; how he tramped long distances to cheat the police, and said mass in his crowded parish church at one, two, or three o’clock in

the morning; how he disguised himself as a commercial traveller, and again as a sailor, we leave the reader to find out for himself. One page of narrative is more effective than a volume of statistics, and many of us will obtain from this volume more idea of the cruelty of the German persecution, of the heroism of the priests, and of the steadfast goodness of their flocks, than from anything that has hitherto appeared. The translation is flowing and idiomatic.

Harmony of the Gospel Narratives of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Our Blessed Lord, from the Vulgate, with English Notes. By the Rev. WILLIAM J. WALSH, D.D., Vice-President and Professor of Theology, St. Patrick College, Maynooth. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1879.

AN ordinary reader of the Gospels has very little idea of the endless difficulties which beset the path of the harmonist. Dr. Walsh has confined his labours to the last week of our Lord's mortal life, and the forty days of His risen life. Yet, as every Bible student knows, this implies no ordinary toil. There are so many vexed questions, so many hypotheses, resulting in a multitude of books and very little harmony, as to frighten most men from the task. Still, the learned Professor of Maynooth, in the service of his Scripture class, has had not only the courage to attempt the task, but also the talent to bring it to a most successful termination. His work consists of two portions, the Harmony itself, and the English Notes which supplement it. The Harmony is admirably arranged, and most carefully printed, so as to present one simultaneous view of the four inspired narratives. In his general arrangement Dr. Walsh does not differ materially from that of Fathers Patrizi and Coleridge. The English notes are intended to explain the reasons in favour of his method of harmony, but they prove both the extent of his reading and the soundness of his judgment. Some of these notes will be of great service to students of theology and Sacred Scripture, inasmuch as they sum up in a few paragraphs the results of long and wearisome dissertations. That on Judas at the Last Supper strikes us as particularly happy; the quotation from the *Lauda Sion*, to show St. Thomas's opinion as to who was the first unworthy communicant, is very apt. The different ways of harmonising St. John's "sixth" hour with St. Mark's "third" are clearly explained. Dr. Walsh prefers to think that our present reading of St. John's text is wrong, and that the third should be substituted for the sixth hour. But we doubt if textual critics would allow him this short and easy method of solving the difficulty. His treatment of the Resurrection narratives seems to us very successful. He distinguishes between the different parties of holy women visiting the tomb at different times on the Easter morning; and we are glad to see that he has not adopted Father Coleridge's interpretation of St. Matthew's "*vespere sabbati*" as meaning a visit overnight.

The Life of Sister Jeanne Bénigne Gojos. By MOTHER M. G. PROVANE DE LEYNI. (Translation.) London: Burns and Oates. 1878.

THIS is an interesting spiritual book, containing the life of a lay-sister of the Visitation in its early days. Sister Jeanne was born in 1615 (whilst S. Francis de Sales was still living), and died in 1692. She outlived by a year or two Blessed Margaret Mary, though the latter was thirty years younger. The whole life suggests a comparison with that of the holy nun of Paray-le-Monial. It is full of the same ardent contemplation, and the reader almost wonders why the Sacred Heart does not appear in its pages. Yet there is no trace of it. The life in God and in our Lord Jesus Christ, such as we have it in all the contemplative Saints, is fully and even exuberantly described in the holy sister's own words; but the images and the analogies are not very different from those of many other souls trained in the spirituality of S. Francis of Sales, and somewhat affected by the literature of the day. For the first Mothers of the Visitation were highly educated women, and, what is more, they were so deeply spiritual that one can see how much, humanly speaking, such souls as B. Margaret Mary and Sister Jeanne were indebted to the wise discretion which so quickly recognised their wonderful gifts, yet so steadily aided them to humility and purity. The daughters of the Visitation, and those of kindred congregations, will welcome this edifying Life, in which they will find much to raise them up and help them on, even if a good deal is too deep for ordinary souls. The translation has been well done.

A Benedictine of the Sixteenth Century (Blosius). By GEORGES DE BLOIS. Translated by Lady LOVAT. London: Burns and Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son. 1878.

THE venerable Blosius is not unknown to the present generation. The edition of the "Mirror for Monks," by Lord Coleridge, has carried his name into circles outside the Catholic Church. A life of the writer of so sweet and pure a book will be acceptable to all who are acquainted with it. Unfortunately, Louis de Blois, or Blosius, has not left behind him the materials for an effective biography. He lived a quiet and shrinking life, although his lot fell in the troubled days of the latter half of the sixteenth century. He did a strenuous and a necessary work; but the history of the reform which he carried out in his monastery of Liessies hardly supplies a single striking or exciting incident. The collateral descendant who, a few years ago, undertook to write the life of this "Benedictine of the Sixteenth Century," has been obliged to have free recourse to padding. The usefulness of monasticism, the glories of past monastic history, sanctity, mysticism, the abdication of Charles V., and a great many other subjects, are not only treated in the preface, with the help of Montalembert, Dom Guéranger, Görres, and Denys the Areopagite, but we have throughout the book a continuous series of "extracts" from these and other writers, which are intended to illumine the incidents of the life, but

which rather suggest what might have been than what really was. Such *subsidia* are not unnecessary in making up a saint's life for the French public; and, indeed, if this translation finds its way into the hands of non-Catholics, as we heartily hope it may, it will be none the less useful or interesting for the interpolations and illustrations which the instructed English Catholic may perhaps find a little wearisome. Blossius was not of French nationality, but of Flemish, being a native of the province of Hainault. He was born in 1506, and lived sixty years, thus witnessing in his manhood and mature age the beginnings and the progress of the Lutheran apostasy. Leaving the Court of the Archduke Charles at the age of fourteen, he entered the Benedictine monastery of Liessies, in his native province. At the very early age of twenty-one he was appointed coadjutor to the aged Abbot, but never seems to have taken any active part in the government until the Abbot's death. He was only twenty-four when he was recalled from his studies at Louvain to bury the Abbot who had chosen him, and to undertake the administration of a relaxed monastery. There seems little doubt, although his biographer will not have it so, that it was his birth and connections which chiefly prompted the community to acquiesce in his appointment. His life, after this, was a long and successful struggle to reform his monks of Liessies. It was not a time to cheer a reformer. Luther was loosening vows and opening the doors of cloisters, and the quarrels and wars of France and Austria were keeping the Flemish frontier in a state of fever. Blossius did the very best possible thing for his community of easy-going, but not badly-inclined, subjects; he gave them the example of forty years of a blameless life, filled with elevating study, and sanctified by tender prayer. In truth, his books show us how he conquered. He used the weapon of a fine and fertile gift of speech, most sweet and unstudied, yet never missing the mark; and that mark was a simple and satisfying devotion to God and to our Saviour. His best work, the "Mirror for Monks," was spoken or read, page by page, in his chapter-house, and passed off as the production of an ancient solitary called Dacryanus. Mere relaxation could not long hold out against the sweet unction, the lofty ideals and the perfect example of an Abbot such as Blossius. He died leaving a happy, an observant, and a united band of monks. The author has a picture of his death-bed which is touching and real; and he compares it to the death of Venerable Bede. The truth is, that a religious always dies, if possible, in the midst of his brethren. Venerable Bede—whatever the author and the pictures may say—did not die alone with the young companion who took down his last words, but surrounded by praying and sorrowing friends—the friends of his long monastic life.

The translation, by Lady Lovat, of this life of a noble monk, is very close and easy. A perfect translation of a thoroughly French book is a miracle; but those who have not compared the original will be well satisfied with this painstaking English version.

The Manuscript Irish Missal belonging to the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Edited with Introduction and Notes by F. E. WARREN, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. London: Pickering. 1879.

NO time has been lost since general attention was last year called to the manuscript in the columns of the *Academy*, in making this Missal, the third in point of age of the four ancient Irish Missals now extant, accessible to the public in print. The thanks of those interested in liturgical studies are due to the Editor for the spirited manner in which he undertook, and has carried out, the work. But, to be candid, it is necessary to say at once that the interest of the publication is only relative, as showing one of the stages by which the old liturgical usages of Ireland were brought into conformity with those of England,* and, hereby, of the rest of Western Europe. The value of the manuscript, which dates from some time between the years 1150 and 1250, will be in a comparison with the earlier Drummond Missal, now in the press, and, perhaps, the later Rosslyn Missal, if this be ever printed.

The labours of the Editor have been performed with evident zeal and pains; much care has been taken in making a comparison throughout with the present Roman, and the new print of the Sarum, Missal; the lessons, epistles and gospels, are collated with the Vulgate, and (for the New Testament) the Codex Amiatinus, the variations being noted in the margin. Even the punctuation of the original manuscript has been retained—a stretch of scrupulosity some may be inclined to consider, in view of the system, or rather entire want of system, of placing stops general in mediæval manuscripts of this date. The introduction contains an elaborate description of the manuscript, its abbreviations and orthography. Here again it might be objected that the pains taken are somewhat excessive. But, whilst it is true that the table of abbreviations, for instance, contains for the most part those which are familiar enough to persons conversant with manuscripts, to whom alone it is to be presumed such a table can be of any use,—at the same time “by its aid (to use the Editor’s words) the original condition of any page can be (generally) reconstructed by the reader,” who is also hereby enabled to exercise a certain independent control, which is not wholly unnecessary. For it must be admitted that with all the Editor’s zeal and good intent, these are not always according to knowledge. For example, an abbreviation (p. 25), extended as “*gradale*” in reality stands for *responsorium*; the responsories *Circumdederunt* and *Ingrediente domino* of the Palm Sunday procession, which figure here (pp. 107–8) as “graduals” might have warned the Editor that there was something wrong in his reading; he seems to have forgotten that although *gradale* alone appears in recent Missals, like the Sarum, this appellation is only a short survival of the true ancient name *responsorium graduale*. The suggestion (p. 22), that the title “Antiphon”

* The well-known Canon of the Council of the Cashel in 1172, is both quoted, and translated, inaccurately at p. 45.

for what is now the Roman Missal called the Introit, "may be regarded as an Irish peculiarity derived perhaps from a similar use of the term in the ancient Gallican liturgy," betrays a similar want of familiarity with liturgical history: it is forgotten that in the ancient liturgical books of the Roman rite, what is now called simply Introit, bears its full title *Antiphona ad introitum*. Again, whilst the manuscript is in fact a "Plenary Missal," and therefore is very far from bearing the aspect of what is technically called a "Sacramentary," the Editor is induced by the presence of a marriage blessing, an order for visiting the sick, &c. (the addition to the Missal of such offices is common enough in manuscripts), to consider that "the volume would be designated a 'Sacramentary' as correctly, or more correctly, than a 'Missal'" (p. 40). Once more: whilst it is not intended to dispute that the mass of St. Patrick (p. 150) is of ancient, or Irish origin, what is oddly described (p. 46) as "the oblique and primitive mode of the Invocation of Saints with which the collect concludes," is not a very satisfactory test of venerable antiquity, as would clearly appear on reference to any of the collects contained, say, in the Proper of the Jesuits, or in the latest possible supplement to the Roman Missal, all of which end as "obliquely" as even a primitive Protestant could desire.

The list of orthographical peculiarities of the manuscript (pp. 34-6) must also be received with some caution; at least the form *linga* for *lingua*, is not borne out by the photographic plate III, line 3, where the manuscript has *lingua* (compare Introduction p. 28).*

Liturgical "peculiarities" are a common pitfall for Editors who do not reflect on the extraordinary variety and similarity of liturgical usages in the Middle Ages, and so are wont to describe as singular what can be proved to have been existent alike in England and Italy, in Bohemia and Ireland. The general absence of rubrics reduces the chance of discoveries or mistakes in the present case. It may be remarked that there is no indication in this Missal of the procession of Corpus Domini on Palm Sunday, which was general in England and most parts of Normandy, in which latter province indeed the custom survived to a period within the memory of persons, of no great age too, still living. The *Exultet*, on Holy Saturday, does not contain the clauses, *O certe necessarium, O felix culpa*, which appear generally in the English books (compare Martene, *De ant., eccl. rit.* vol. iii. cap. 24). The words "*una cum gloriissimo rege nostro N. ejusque nobilissima prole N.*," in the same *Exultet*, hardly deserve the stress laid upon them by the Editor (p. 47); they are not peculiar to this manuscript, but occur in both French and German books; among English Missals that of Hereford presents a form (*una cum . . . Anglo-rum rege N. et principe nostro N.*), itself copied (like many other Hereford "peculiarities") from Rouen, which may perhaps be taken to

* Page 90, line 9 from the bottom, read *ut* for *et*, as in Plate II., line 7, and as required by the sense:—The sign which the Editor reads as *z* in such words as *Stephanus, Baptista*, is read without scruple by Mr. Gilbert (who should know his business) as *st*, in the "Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Ireland." Perhaps it would be well to acquiesce in his reading; although, in the Drummond manuscript, the same sign occurs in the word *exorcize*.

come near to them. Moreover, the manuscript itself shows that the hypothesis of the "scribe slavishly copying some predecessor's work, and reproducing exactly words which, under altered circumstances, could bear no meaning at all," is not so "unreasonable and improbable" as the Editor seems to think : witness the words occurring on Good Friday, *Oremus et pro Christianissimo imperatore nostro*, &c. (p. 123). During the earlier part of the Nuptial Mass, the newly-married pair are directed to hold lighted torches (p. 81); (so also in the Hanley Castle Missal of the thirteenth century, Surtees Society, vol. lxiii. p. 164, and in Martene's Marriage Order II., from a very ancient Rennes Missal). The blessing of the ring was prolonged by the recitation of nearly the whole of the long sixty-seventh Psalm (p. 81); most rituals were content to cut the matter short with the verse *Manda deus* and the two following.

Not the least interesting portion of the volume is the comparative table, at the beginning, of the Canon of the Mass as contained in the four existing Irish Missals. It makes the reader the more desirous that the time may not be distant when its noble owner will permit the Stowe Missal to be printed; and (what may not be so easy of attainment) that the task may fall to the hands of an Editor who shall be at the same time a skilled Irish scholar and a practised liturgist. Meantime the present instalment of Irish liturgical remains may be received with gratitude; and although the volume does not bear evidence of any very advanced stage of liturgical research within the University of Oxford, it is at least a welcome sign of the increasing activity in that department which the Editor assures us is manifesting itself in that ancient home of learning. The patience and industry to which this publication bears witness cannot fail in time to produce their legitimate fruit. It is to be hoped that Catholics, to whom this branch of learning is, or should be, a natural inheritance, may not, through their own supineness and neglect, find it occupied by strangers.

A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament.
By BROOKE FOX WESTCOTT, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity,
and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fourth edition.
Macmillan.

The Bible in the Church, a popular Account of the Collection and Reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Churches. By
BROOKE FOX WESTCOTT, D.D. New edition. Macmillan.

DR. WESTCOTT is an honourable example of the best kind of theological scholarship which the University of Cambridge produces. Clear, candid, conscientious, of wide reading and disciplined intellect, he possesses many of the qualities which go to make up a sound ecclesiastical historian; on the other hand, his great defect, and as we have often pointed out, it is the original sin of the school to which he belongs, is the absence from his mind of any clear conception of the *Ecclesia Dei*. The Church, whether of the first century or of the nineteenth, is to him, not a fact, but a phrase.

It is now many years since Dr. Westcott began to make the "Canon of the New Testament" his special study. The preface to the first edition of his book is dated 1855, and it is well known that for many years before that date he was engaged in the researches of which this work was the issue. The special value of this fourth edition lies in the introduction of twenty-eight pages, in which Dr. Westcott answers "the elaborate and continuous criticism" to which he had been subjected by the author of "Supernatural Religion." While thanking that writer for pointing out to him "several omissions, one or two errors of detail, and many imperfections of language," which he has now "done his best to correct," he observes that his chief obligation to his learned opponent is of a different kind.

I owe to him (Dr. Westcott writes) a more complete conviction than I could have otherwise had of the soundness of the conclusions which I have maintained. . . . And, this being so, I do not know that I can make a better return for the service I have received than by pointing out some cases, more or less serious, in which he has fallen into error.—Preface, p. xvii.

For an exposure of these errors, not the less, but much the more telling, because of the courtesy, temper, and charity with which it is made, we must refer our readers to Dr. Westcott's own pages; and in return for the information which we have ourselves received from them we will make one remark, applicable alike to the volume on the "Canon of the New Testament," and to the smaller and more popular work founded upon it, and forming part of Messrs. Macmillan's series of School Class-books, in which the author has furnished a brief history of the whole Bible. That remark is this: that the haziness of conception regarding the character and office of the Church of God, of which we spoke just now as being Dr. Westcott's great underlying defect, comes out very curiously and significantly in what he says about the formation and proof of the Canon. To the question, "Why do we receive the Canonical Books?" we find no plain and intelligible answer in his pages. Of course, the answer which a Catholic would at once give would be in the words of St. Augustine: "Because the authority of the Church moves me to do," &c. And, as it seems to us, any man who looks the matter fairly in the face, may justly add, with the Saint, that he would not believe the Gospel on any other authority. As a matter of fact, it is from the Council of Carthage and the decretal of Pope Innocent* that Dr. Westcott himself accepts the sacred books; for we are sure that we are doing him only bare justice when we assume that he is far too intelligent to accept them, or anything else, upon the word of the religious communion of which he is an ornament. The Sixth Article of Religion, indeed, of the Established Church states, that its framers, "in the name of Holy Scripture, do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose

* Dr. Westcott observes that the authenticity of this decretal "is very questionable" ("Canon of the New Testament," p. 449, note 4). It seems to us that there is no sufficient reason for questioning it at all. But the subject is too large to be discussed in a note.

authority was never any doubt in the Church." But in truth, as may be seen at large in Dr. Westcott's pages, there is hardly a book of the New Testament Canon which has not been doubted. External authority is, beyond all question, the only voucher for Canonicity. It was for the Church here, as in doctrinal controversies, to judge of conflicting traditions and diverging opinions, and in the fulness of time to give her sentence. And, in fact, so she judged, and judged infallibly, or her judgment is vain. The action of the Church in this matter is but an illustration of the great law of her working, which has been well stated by a recent writer:—

Her whole history (he writes) as she herself tells us, may be described as a history of supernatural selection. The Church may be conceived of as a living organism, for ever and on all sides putting forth feelers and tentacles, that seize, try, and seem to dally with all kinds of nutriment. A part of this she at length takes into herself. A large part she at length puts down again. Much that is thus rejected she seems for a long time on the point of choosing. But however slow may be the final decision in coming, however reluctant or hesitating it may seem to be, when it is once made, it is claimed for it that it is infallible. And this claim (Mr. Mallock adds) is one, as we shall see when we understand its nature, that no study of ecclesiastical history, no study of comparative mythology, can invalidate now, or even promise to invalidate.—*Is Life Worth Living?* p. 235.

Replete with learning as Dr. Westcott's books are, we feel sure that he does not, in fact, understand the nature of this claim. To accept the Bible, in any true sense, as the Word of God, logically involves a belief in the infallibility of the Church. For the Bible is her creation.

Johnson's Select Works. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by ALFRED MILNES, B.A. (Lond.), late Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

JOHNSON'S "Lives of the Poets" are perhaps as charming reading as is to be found in English literature, and the two which Mr. Milnes has here published—those of Pope and Dryden—are among the best of them. As Mr. Milnes has remarked—

It is not as expositions of fact that these lives are valuable. Their value lies in the wisdom, the knowledge of men and things, which lies scattered over almost every page, sparkling in shrewd remark and epigram. Regarded as collections of facts, these lives are full of errors.—Intro. p. xxx.

Such errors are pointed out by Mr. Milnes, in notes which embrace a great amount of matter very valuable to students. Besides the "Lives of Pope and Dryden," the volume contains *Rasselas*; and, in the introduction, a very interesting and suggestive comparison is drawn between this work and "Candide."

On Some Influences of Christianity upon National Character. Three Lectures. By A. W. CHURCH, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's. London: Macmillan.

THESE lectures display very signally both the characteristic excellencies and defects of their author. On the one hand, they are throughout thoughtful and scholarly, and not unfrequently rise into a grave and solemn eloquence. On the other, they are too often vague, indeterminate, and inconclusive. In them, Mr. Church sets himself to consider some of the ways in which National Character has been affected by Christianity, and to trace these effects in certain leading types. The types in question are furnished by the European races belonging to the Eastern Church, particularly the Greeks, by the Southern and Latin races, particularly the Italians and French, and by the Teutonic races. To each of these three types a lecture is devoted. The subject is obviously a very large one, and the author does not profess to do more than treat it in the barest outline. By way of specimen of his work, we will quote two passages with which we are entirely in harmony. The first is one in which he insists that nations, like the individual men of whom they are composed, have a distinctive character. He observes:—

That there is such a thing is as certain as that there is a general type of physiognomy or expression characteristic of different races. One by one, no doubt, many faces might belong equally to Englishmen or Frenchmen, Italians, Greeks or Russians. But, in spite of individual uncertainties, the type, on the whole, asserts itself with curious clearness. If you cannot be sure of it in single faces, it strikes you in a crowd. . . . So it is with national character. The attempt to define it, to criticise it, to trace its sources, to distinguish between what it is and what it seems, to compare and balance its good and its bad—this attempt may be awkward and bungling, may be feeble, one-sided, unjust. It may really miss all the essential and important features, and dwell with disproportionate emphasis on such as are partial and trivial, or are not peculiarities at all. Bad portrait painting is not uncommon. Yet each face has its character and expression unlike every other, if only the painter can seize it. And so, in those great societies of men which we call nations, there is a distinct aspect belonging to them as wholes, which the eye catches and retains, even if it cannot detect its secret, and the hand is unequal to reproduce it. Its reality is betrayed, and the consciousness of its presence revealed, by the antipathies of nations, and their current judgments one of another.—P. 4.

This is we think both profoundly true and admirably expressed. Not less true, nor less admirably expressed, is a passage towards the conclusion, in which he considers how far Christianity has, in fact, influenced the character of the peoples who have received it:—

We have seen that Christianity is very different in its influence on different national characters. It has wrought with nations as with men. For it does not merely gain their adherence, but within definite limits it develops differences of temperament and mind. Human nature has many sides, and under the powerful and fruitful influence of Christianity these sides are brought out in varying proportions; unlike Mahometanism, which seems to produce a singularly uniform monotony of character in races, however naturally different, in which it gets a hold, Christianity

has been in its results, viewed on a large scale, as singularly diversified; and not only diversified, but incomplete: it has succeeded, and it has failed; for it has aimed much higher, it has demanded much more, it has had to reckon with far more subtle and complicated obstacles. If it had mastered its special provinces of human society as Mahometanism has mastered Arabs and Turks, the world would be very different from what it is. Yes; it has fallen far short of that completeness. The fruits of its power and discipline have been partial. It is open to any one, and easy enough, to point out the shortcomings of Saints; and much more, the faults and vices of Christian nations; but the lesson of history, I think, is this: not that all the good which might have been hoped for society has followed from the appearance of Christian religion in the forefront of human life; not that in this wilful and blundering world, so full of misused gifts, and wasted opportunities and disappointed promise, mistake and mischief have never been in its train; not that in the nations where it has gained a footing it has mastered their besetting sins: the falsehood of one, the ferocity of another, the characteristic sensuality, the characteristic arrogance of others. But history teaches us this: that in tracing back the course of human improvement we come, in one case after another, upon Christianity as the source from which improvement derived its principle and its motive; we find no other source adequate to account for the new spring of amendment; and, without it, no other sources of good could have been relied upon. It was not only the strongest element of salutary change, but one, without which, others would have had no chance.—P. 138.

The Life of St. Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln; with some Account of his Predecessors in the See of Lincoln. By GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A., Canon of Lincoln. London: John Murray. 1879.

ST. HUGH of Lincoln stands out as one of the foremost figures in the history of mediæval England, a great prelate and a great Saint. Mr. Perry, who is a Protestant Canon of Lincoln, has undertaken in the volume before us to give an account of this great man's life and of his predecessors in the See. The qualifications which Mr. Perry brings to his task are numerous and respectable. He is a skilled antiquarian, a man of liberal mind, and, as is evident, of fixed determination to be as fair as he can. Moreover, he has a sincere admiration for the subject he has chosen. All this is much, but it is not enough to make up for the great initial difficulty which the undertaking possesses for Mr. Perry. Perhaps of all the difficulties which the Catholic Church presents to learned and candid minds external to her, the greatest is that which is found in her Saints. What view can a Protestant divine take of them which is consistent with respect both for them and for himself? Nothing is clearer than that the religion which St. Hugh professed was very far removed from that which Mr. Perry spends his life in teaching; that either St. Hugh must have been, or that Mr. Perry must be, deplorably in error. There can be no sort of doubt how Mr. Perry would have fared, if—the case may be supposed by way of argument—he had presented himself before the Saint with his nine-and-thirty Articles and his book of Common Prayer. And, as a matter of fact, we know how the "glorious

Reformers" who are Mr. Perry's spiritual ancestors treated all that was left of the Saint for their sacrilegious hands to deal with—his sacred and wonder-working relics. Not daunted, however, by this consideration, Mr. Perry dedicates his volume to "the Right Reverend Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln, the successor of St. Hugh, alike in his virtues as in his See." Mr. Perry must know as well as we do that Dr. Wordsworth has as little in common with St. Hugh as the strange costume distinctive of the Anglican Episcopate—irreverently called "Magpie" by the Ritualists, as we are told—has in common with the Pontifical vestments of Catholicism. Dr. Wordsworth's virtues we by no means call in question. But they are virtues chiefly of the domestic order, very far removed from the supernatural perfection which adorned the Saint. We have no desire to say a hard word of Mr. Perry, whose book is the work of a scholar and a gentleman, but really the way of writing of which we are speaking seems scarcely honest.

And what shall we say of the mode in which Mr. Perry deals with the miracles of the Saint? Let him, himself, describe his treatment of them:—

It is, indeed, most difficult to know how to treat these solemnly-attested records of miracles. It is impossible to credit them upon the testimony of men who were interested in establishing, who were *à priori* disposed to expect, a miracle, and who would have thought it impious to exercise the critical faculty in the matter. Testimony of this class, however respectable and however multiplied, is not sufficient by the very nature of the case, to overcome the *à priori* improbability attaching to a miracle. But it is invidious and irksome to be ever accusing men, probably sincere, of fiction and deceit, and it seems almost hopeless to attempt to sever the true from the doubtful in the case of an alleged miraculous occurrence. Such alleged facts are therefore, it seems, best omitted altogether from what aspires to be a veracious history, and neither harshly condemned nor critically examined. Happily, in the case of St. Hugh, there are quite sufficient facts recorded of him into which the miraculous element does not at all enter, to enable us to give a full delineation of his character, and to represent him as a real man, moving and acting among real men.—P. 171.

Mr. Perry, in fact, takes the miracles out of the Saint's life and puts them into an appendix, because he does not know what to make of them. He is too ingenuous to deny the force of the evidence upon which they rest. But he will not admit them to be true. We put it to him—Why should they not be true? Does he maintain that there have been no miracles since the days of the Apostles? And if so, upon what does he rest the proof of this thesis, which, as he well knows, was never heard of until a few centuries ago?

Address to the Biological Section of the British Association. Sheffield, August, 1879. By Professor ST. GEORGE MIVART, F.R.S., President of the Section.

THE late meeting of the British Association at Sheffield was remarkable both from the tone of some of the principal addresses, and from some of the discussions (brief, but important) which took place after the addresses had been delivered.

The President, Dr. Allman, in his opening address, after explaining what protoplasm was, which, he said, "lies at the base of every vital phenomenon," proceeded to state that a *cell* is a definite mass of Protoplasm having a nucleus imbedded in it. All organic life, he added, vegetable or animal, is made up of such cells. He went on to dwell on the "essential unity of the two great kingdoms of organic nature," and he stated (as an instance) that plants can be placed under the influence of anæsthetics, and thus their various functions become suspended, as the sensitive plant, when etherized, ceases to shrink from the touch. It is curious that two particles of Protoplasm are apparently so identical that neither by the microscope nor by any chemical process can you detect any difference, and yet the one can only develop into a jelly-fish, and the other into a man—there being some fundamental difference hidden in their molecular constitution. He concludes by utterly repudiating materialism. "No one," he says, "has ever built up one particle of living matter out of lifeless elements." Referring, partly at least, to the vegetable kingdom, he says, "Many things, to all appearance the result of volition, are capable of being explained as absolutely unconscious acts." And, finally, "The chasm between unconscious life and thought is deep and impassable."

Professor Mivart, in a very able address to the "Biological Section," took for his theme the works of the great naturalist Buffon. He alluded to his speculations on animal variation, arising, as it sometimes has done, from migration, and also from degradation. But the most important part of his Paper was a dissertation on the resemblances and differences between the mind of man and the higher faculties of animals. Among other forcible remarks, he observed: "If animals were capable of deliberately acting in concert, the effects would soon make themselves known to us so forcibly as to prevent the possibility of mistake." Then he touches, as Dr. Allman had done, on some curious movements in plants, among which are some which seem to be spontaneous, but which cannot really be attributed to volition. On the whole, he maintained what we hold to be the teaching at once of sound science and common sense—that though vegetables in some cases *simulate* animal instinct, and animals *simulate* human reason, yet there is a real difference in kind between all three. Vegetables have no true sentience, and animals no true reason.

In the discussion which ensued, Sir John Lubbock controverted Mr. Mivart's opinions, and referred to his own experiments with ants to prove that animals communicate with each other; but we did not think his argument was much to the point. The President, Dr. Allmann (who was present), supported Mr. Mivart's view.

Mr. Tylor's address to the Anthropological Section contained much interesting matter. He intimated an opinion that primitive man was not *savage*. He said that the savage condition, though rude, "never looks absolutely primitive," and "no savage language ever has the appearance of being a primitive language." He inclined also to a more moderate estimate than many others have formed of the antiquity of man on the earth. Sir John Lubbock (who was again present) controverted this latter view on the ground that a probability exists of the glacial period (when man was on the earth) being very remote, and this for certain astronomical reasons, of which Mr. Croll has been the great exponent, but which we have no room to dwell upon at present. The theory is a plausible one, but open to great doubt. Mr. Tylor, again replying, hinted that he rather agreed with the late Chevalier Bunsen in putting the antiquity of man at about 30,000 years back. This, of course, is far beyond the old computation, but moderate as compared with some modern speculation. We may observe that it is now questioned, on geological grounds, whether the deposits in the valley of the Somme, about which so much was said some years ago, are really so ancient as was then supposed.

There were some other Papers, well worthy of notice, read at the meeting of the British Association—one by Mr. Crookes, on "Radiant Matter;" one by Professor Ayrton, on "Electricity as a Motive Power;" one by Professor Lankester, on "Degeneration;" one by Mr. Shoolbred, on "Recent Improvements in Electric Lighting." But our space does not admit of our discussing these in detail. The meeting next year is to be at Swansea.

A Gracious Life. Being the Life of Barbara Acarie (Blessed Mary of the Incarnation). By EMILY BOWLES. Quarterly Series. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

WE can cordially recommend this work as a volume of interesting and edifying reading. The life of Madame Acarie is fuller of dramatic incident than are generally the lives of holy women; and her life is here told in a clear and pleasing style, so that even the reader who may dip into the volume with little esteem for the records of sanctity *per se*, is led to read on for the charm of the story-teller. A spirit of sensible, but withal kind criticism, has also guided the authoress's pen, and we have not here one of those over-perfect lives, the very perfection of which, and their complete want of all human shortcomings and passions, often defeat the aim of the zealous biographer. The life of Madame Acarie is specially calculated to teach an appropriate lesson to ordinary men and women striving to be good at home and in the world. Out of a life of fifty-two years, she spent thirty-two with her husband and in the rearing and education of her family; only the last four years before death she passed in the cloister, under the name of Mary of the Incarnation: and that long married life is full of incident and struggle. At sixteen, she believed she had a

vocation to the religious life, but, with a singular sentiment of obedience to her mother, she gave up her own desire, and at sixteen and a half (in 1582) married the man of her mother's choice. Her husband's troubles from his connection with "the League," his banishment from Paris, her long separation from him, her unwearying labours and efforts in his behalf, her struggle with poverty and the scorn of angry relatives, her prudent care of her children and admirable system of education for them, her zealous and successful works of charity for the poor and the needy of every class, her unfaltering love and devotion to her husband through all his misfortunes, no less than in their happy reunion, all together form a noble picture that cannot fail to be both charming and useful. The history of Madame Acarie's connection with the Carmelite Order, the leading part she took in the introduction of S. Teresa's Reform into France, and her final entry as a lay sister into a convent of the Order, form by no means the least interesting portion of this beautiful book.

We venture to make the suggestion to the conductors of the "Quarterly Series" that an edition of this life of Madame Acarie at so low a price as to place it within the reach of the bulk of our Catholic flocks—with enough love of reading, but few shillings to spare for books—would be a boon which they would be quick to avail themselves of. The main strength of the enemy in this matter of literature is cheapness and attraction of style. But we fear that after the philippic which his conscience prompts against the active invasion of trash and wickedness through cheap books and periodicals, the pastor has to reflect with pain that there is little or no good Catholic pasturage yet, in this country, within the reach of his poorer people. The slow mental poison is to be bought readily week by week in "illustrated" pennyworths, most novels in shilling editions; and the healthy substitute can only hope to spread its leaven when it is of equally easy reach. The volume before us is fitted by the natural attraction of its subject-matter, and the added charm of the writer, to be a successful forerunner in the creation of a demand among middle and working-class Catholics for healthy and pious reading.

Three Catholic Reformers of the Fifteenth Century. By MARY H. ALLIES. Quarterly Series. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

THIS volume contains sketches of the more characteristic incidents in the lives of three Saints—Vincent Ferrer, Bernardine of Siena, and John Capistran. The three Saints are grouped together, not only because they were contemporaries, but because they had a somewhat similar mission of preaching confided to them. St. Vincent Ferrer, the "Apostle of the Judgment," was sent to Spain, France, Italy, England, Ireland, and Scotland, but Spain and France were the chief scenes of his Apostolic labours; St. Bernardine carried the same work into Italy; St. John Capistran was the "Apostle of Peace" to those troubled times, more especially to Italy and Germany.

"Three Catholic Reformers" ought to teach a much-needed lesson—

that there were in the Church of the fifteenth century men who saw its evils as vividly as did any of the so-called reformers of the sixteenth; and that these men set about the reformation with no less zeal and resolve than did the men of a century later, but after a different manner. As the authoress shows, they reformed themselves first, and then turned to do the work for others, armed with the double sword of authority and example. The state of things in France and Europe generally, which St. Vincent felt demanded his Apostolate, is thus described by himself:—

I think there has never been so much vain luxury and impurity as there is now in the world, for we should have to go back to the Flood in order to find worse times. . . . With priests it is the reign of simony, and with religious that of envy. The intemperance of laymen and of priests is such that the Fast of Lent, the Ember days and Vigils, are no longer observed. Anger is so common that amongst those who pretend to be friends murder is not unfrequent. Indeed, vice is so far in the ascendant, that individuals who prefer prayer and the service of God to the world and its pomps are called useless and idle.—P. 28.

St. Bernardine of Siena saw even more to grieve his heart in the Italy of his day, and he speaks of it in words equally clear and pointed. He “vigorously attacked the habit of usury, gambling, and the refinement of luxury in women’s dress.” His denunciations of the evils attending the last mentioned (pp. 118–126) are not too strong, perhaps, for a timely warning at the present day.

Thus these men of the fifteenth century saw at least as much as Luther saw, and spoke of it in as severe terms, excepting, of course, the coarseness of his blasphemy.

The present work will also show the reader what kind of man the Catholic reformer made himself. Of course he was not paradoxical enough to marry in order to teach continence, or to disobey flagrantly those who sat in the chair of Moses, as the best means of drawing on himself Heaven’s blessing and of winning the allegiance of his followers. St. Vincent Ferrer’s life

was a daily wonder even in that age, when, if sensuality was as rife as in our times, great mortifications were frequent too. His sleep lasted five hours, and he took his repose either on the ground or on a bundle of rods, spending the rest of the night in prayer and meditation of his beloved Bible. . . . Every morning, he who was to be the Apostle of reconciliation for so many souls, humbled himself first in confession. . . . At midday he took his single meal. Except on Sundays his life was a continual fast.—P. 33.

The reader will find in this well-written volume the lives of three such reformers cleverly sketched; it is both an agreeable and an instructive book.

The Sermon on the Mount (from the end of the Lord’s Prayer).
By HENRY JAMES COLERIDGE, S.J. London: Burns and Oates.
1878.

THIS forms the fourth volume of “The Public Life of our Lord,” by Father Coleridge, and is occupied with the Sermon on the

Mount from the end of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 13) to its close. A commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, is, as indeed the author mentions in his Preface, an arduous undertaking under any circumstances. This volume has been written, as he reminds us, "without ever being able to lay aside other, and sometimes very distracting, occupations;" nevertheless it shows no flagging of power or attention, and forms a worthy portion of what will, when finished, be a complete and able popular commentary on the Life of our Lord in good original English. Such a work has long been a desideratum for English-reading Catholics, and we gladly note, as significant of the appreciation which it has received, that Vols. I. and II. have already reached second editions. Any remarks of ours as to the value of the author's scriptural writings, of this part of them in particular, would, we need hardly say, be in a strain of admiration, and therefore, at this advanced stage, superfluous. Father Coleridge has long enjoyed a high and deserved reputation for this class of writing. It will be enough, then, to observe here what kind of work this "Public Life of our Lord" is, to recommend it to those who may not already possess it. It is not a Scripture Commentary in the ordinary acceptance; not a detailed explanation and reflection on each succeeding verse of the text. It consists of a series of "Readings"—which are both exegetical, moral, and devotional—not sermons, but connected and freely-written chapters with much of the character of Homilies. Each chapter takes for its subject a thought as expressed by either a group of connected verses, or by a single word in a verse, as the case may be. Thus in the present volume on the three verses of S. Matt. vi. 16–18, we have Chapters I., II., III., headed respectively, "The Law of Mortification," "The Range of Mortification," and "Fasting;" while Chapter IV., on an expression in verse 18, is headed, "Our Father in Secret." The last is a beautiful development of all the senses and bearings of this expression, and the import of the lessons we are to learn. Further on, some twenty-six pages form a chapter headed "The Eye of the Soul," and are a detailed and singularly clear explanation of our Lord's expression in verses 22, 23. The advantage of such a learned commentary as this on the whole public life of our Lord, is much lessened, some may think, by its necessary length: this has already reached its fourth volume, and has got only as far as the end of the Sermon on the Mount. We are of opinion, however, that even its fulness and somewhat diffuse style is exactly calculated—perhaps deliberately intended by its author—to effect a much-needed good result. Priests and religious accustomed to the practice of meditation may prefer to read a pithy if not crabbedly-worded old commentary, and evolve its latent meaning and its multitudinous applications for themselves. But the majority of people cannot do this for themselves even in politics and social matters; even men of some education need the daily newspaper article to trace the consequences of an event for them; much less can they in the case of the Scriptures, with their spirituality, mysticism, and various meanings. Yet this large class of well-disposed people more especially need this unfolding of the revelation of God for their edification and guidance. But we venture to think, that in addition to these, there

are few of us who may not derive from a quiet perusal of Father Coleridge's book, very much of both spiritual pleasure and profit. We earnestly trust that the Rev. Author will enjoy both health and strength to complete the great work he has undertaken.

The Credentials of the Catholic Church. By the Rev. J. B. BAGSHAWE.
London : R. Washbourne. 1879.

THIS extremely useful book is rather for the benefit of the Ritualists and other high churchmen, than of the Rationalists and the Agnostics. Father Bagshawe's proof that the Roman Church is the Church of God almost takes for granted that God has really founded a Church. Perhaps the work would have been improved if the writer had carefully drawn out the Scripture proof, in both Testaments, that Christ has founded a perpetual body of authoritative and infallible teachers. This proof is extremely cogent, and the texts of Scripture, with a brief commentary to bring out their force, could be all put in half a dozen pages. Its exhibition would have the incidental advantage of showing what is really meant by the term Church. On this subject there is a promising chapter, entitled "The essential characteristics of the Church;" but on examination it turns out to contain, first, a demolition of the "invisible Church" theory, and of the "branch-Church" idea; and, secondly, a proof that the Church is an organized and living body. All this is useful, especially as against the Ritualists, whom our author seems to have chiefly in his mind throughout the book. But the handling of the Scripture texts and analogies is too meagre and desultory; something more precise, complete, and scientific was wanted, and could easily, it would seem, have been supplied.

However, Father Bagshawe is strong and cogent on his own ground. His demonstration that the Catholic Church is the only body with any pretence to ancient origin, continued identity and actual vigorous life, is complete and convincing. All the forty pages of Chapter VI. are valuable and excellent. Again, his preliminary, but most necessary explanation of the state of the question between authority and the absence of authority, is just what is wanted. "Private judgment" he not merely proves to be absurd, but shows to be actually impossible in practical working on a large scale. This latter observation should not be lost sight of in controversy. A man who comes to see that even in his sect or heresy he simply follows his minister or his school-master, easily submits his mind to the majestic claims of the Catholic Church. In Chapter II., Father Bagshawe deals heavy blows on the Church of England; blows which would be more effective if she were anything but an ecclesiastical *simulacrum* covering a very secular and substantial body corporate, to neither of which entities can logic or Scripture do much harm.

This book is written in a calm, dispassionate, and reasoning style, and covers a large portion of the ground occupied by the controversy

of the present hour. It will be useful to priests, and useful to inquirers.

We must take exception to the following sentence: "A proof founded on a syllogism might be as strong as you please, but it would never lead mankind to any real conviction in such a matter" as the existence of the Church (p. 179). What can a proof be "founded on," or rather, what can it be, except syllogism? There is no alternative between a syllogism and a jump, if the word is allowable. It is permissible to condense syllogistic reasoning; but only on condition that every syllogism is at hand when wanted; and if you take a step further than your last syllogism, you step out in the air. What Father Bagshawe means is, that a chain of facts, or a *cumulus* of facts, will not prove a universal conclusion; or, therefore, a necessary and demonstrated proposition. But they may prove a certain proposition: and they would do this by syllogism as far as they did it at all.

Lectures on the Labour Question. By THOMAS BRASSEY, M.P. Third edition. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1878.

THESE able lectures will be more fully discussed in some Papers we purpose submitting later on to our readers. We look to them for considerable aid and guidance in treating of the great Labour and Capital Question. They are the work of one who stands, as it were, midway between Capital and Labour; whose Capital was—and but a few years ago—the result of well-directed and persevering labour, and who now is sufficiently aloof from the interests of a master to enable him to deal with the most delicate topics in a manner that has on several notable occasions rendered his words acceptable to the men. If the influence of the Unions had not already begun to be on the wane, it is such men as this writer who would have opened the workmen's eyes to the suicidal policy of most of their contentions against capitalists. He deals with many phases of the great question in a bold, searching, and thoroughly independent spirit. There is no truckling to the "British Workman," whose mistakes and follies are as freely dealt with as are the blunders of capitalists. His one aim is apparent, and that is to get at facts and use them legitimately. These facts are most various in character, and have to be elicited from statistics which would have appalled a less determined, and baffled a less searching, mind. Much of what he gives us in this volume was written some half-dozen years ago. The careful perusal of these earlier portions of his work cannot fail to win the reader's confidence, for his forebodings have been subsequently seen to be completely confirmed by events. "At no distant period," he wrote in 1873, "the progress of our commerce may sustain at least a temporary check. It will be sad indeed if the receding tide leaves behind it large multitudes of our highly-paid workmen, without the slightest provision to meet a period of adversity." Far from wishing to see the workman with lower wages, he repeatedly proves that "to minimise wages is by no means the most effectual method of securing economy of production" (p. 232), and refers to his

own father's conduct in support of this view. On one occasion, as an instance, "he desisted from all further examination of an estimate, saying that if business could only be obtained by screwing down wages, he would rather be without it. A similar feeling I believe to be generally entertained by employers" (p. 14). There is much to be said upon the subject of this last sentence. Were the feeling brought into action as generally as Mr. Brassey believes it to exist, there would soon be an end to both Trades-Unions and Strikes.

On the other hand, the author painfully acknowledges that "less work is now performed in an hour than formerly, when ten hours constituted an ordinary day's work" (p. 54); or, as Mr. Lucas, in his speech at the discussion upon Mr. Brassey's Paper, forcibly puts it: "The result which is arrived at from books accurately and carefully kept, and to an examination of which I invite any of your Council, is broadly that there is now little more than half the work done for ninepence than there was formerly done for sixpence—a fact which I am prepared to prove" (p. 309). And this is the opinion of one who goes on to admit that: "As to the hours of labour, there is no firm, perhaps, more responsible for their shortening than mine. I thought it was desirable to let the men work only nine hours, and I am prepared to say that I made a mistake. I judged the men by myself, and thought that if they had a half-holiday, and an hour less to work each day, they would work with increased will during the remainder of the time; but it has not proved so, and I do feel very strongly that it has been a mistake," &c. (p. 313). And Mr. Brassey cannot refrain from a similar complaint: "I am informed that there is no appreciable difference in the dress or appearance of the working-man in the town in which my works are situated, that there is more money and more time spent in the public-house, and that time in the morning is not so well kept now as it was before the nine hours movement commenced" (p. 55).

Into the author's investigation of the failings of capitalists, and his discussions upon co-operative organizations, trades-unions, popular education, strikes, foreign competition, and the Church—Established Church, of course—in relation to the labour question, as well as his action in regard to the South Wales Colliery strike, which he justly styles "unfortunate," we cannot just now accompany him. But we can conscientiously recommend his work as pre-eminently one of the very best attempts at working out the solution of several great social problems.

Legends of the Saxon Saints. By AUBREY DE VERE. London: Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

MR. DE VERE has laboured long and devotedly for Catholic literature, and the publication of a new book bearing his name deserves to be a welcome event. The preface to the present poem forms in itself a brilliant essay on the growth and destiny of the branch of the hard and rough Teuton-Scandinavian stock, which, after being preserved from the dangers of luxury, riches, and culture, became in the Anglo-Saxon race eminently fitted to receive that revelation of the

truth, which softer races and culture worshippers were questioning or practically abandoning. In this preface the author himself tells in a few words the scope which he designed to give to his versified account of the action of the Faith upon this Anglo-Saxon people, which "a stern history had trained for a wonderful destiny." "The aim of the *Legends of the Saxon Saints*," he says, "is to illustrate England, her different races and predominant characteristics, during the century of her conversion to Christianity, and in doing this to indicate what circumstances had proved favourable or unfavourable to the reception of the Faith. . . . It seemed also expedient to select for treatment not only those records most abounding in the picturesque and poetic, but likewise others useful as illustrating the chief representatives of a many-sided society; the pagan king and the British warrior, the bard of Odin and the prophetess of Odin, the Gaelic missionary and the Roman missionary, the poet and the historian of Anglo-Saxon Christianity." There was one great advantage in such a subject; it was untrodden ground. But there was a compensating disadvantage—the sparse and hard records of the time furnish very few poetic situations or incidents, and this disadvantage becomes still more apparent when the scope of the work is made so very wide, and when it is intended to convey such a large amount of historical narrative and illustration. It is, indeed, where Odin and the struggles and strifes of misbelief are left out of account, that the poem rises highest; and the passages that give evidence of warmth and inspiration are the pictures of the Saints and not of the warriors. For that reason we could have wished to have seen more of the peaceful life of the Saxon Saints, the life of the Church, where whole families seemed to have sanctity for a royal inheritance, and where the crown was laid aside by so many kingly and queenly hands, that its place long-grudged might at last be taken by the veil or the cowl. Many of the most beautiful of the Saxon legends belong, of course, to a later period than that chronicled by Bede, whose history the poet has chosen almost exclusively to follow. Perhaps later he will give us the legends of a later time, or at least more of the flowers, if less of the wholesome fruit, of historical instruction. But there is one of Bede's most beautiful narratives which we miss; let us hope that as St. Etheldreda has once again received back her London church, after three centuries of desecration, there will be found room among some other Saxon legends for the story of her jealously-guarded virginity, her relinquished diadem, her last hidden years, and long after her death the exhuming of the body beautiful as if she slept, and its veneration by the people and by the abbess, who herself had once worn a crown. The poet, who is a faithful historian as well, was more bent upon accomplishing his first plan, than upon giving merely attractive pictures; and having his plan once marked out he certainly accomplished it with wonderful success; for, considering how brief and barren of detail are Bede's accounts of many of the events selected, the only wonder is that they could be clothed in verse at all. But as for those points where accuracy still left a chance for display of imagination and power, they seem to have been eagerly seized, and in some instances the few

historic details are lighted up with the glow of a most happy inspiration. Every one knows the story of Cædmon, the first English poet, the cowherd to whom was given suddenly in his age the gift of song. But who that has read here the account of the coming of the gift, can preserve the story in his memory henceforth in any other form than the picture that is conjured up in a few lines of "Cædmon the Cowherd?" Bede's account is simply that on one occasion, pressed to give a song at a feast, the man went away to the stable, and lay down to sleep among the cattle; and there appeared to him a stranger, who, after asking in vain, commanded him to sing, and gave as his theme the praise of the Creation. The few descriptive touches given by the Venerable Bede (such as "Advanced in Years") have first been expanded into a whole description of Cædmon.

Humble he was in station, meek of soul,
Unlettered, yet heart-wise. His face was pale;
Stately his frame, though slightly bent by age:
Slow were his eyes, and slow his speech, and slow
His musing step; and slow his hand to wrath,
A massive hand, but soft, that many a time
Had succoured man and woman, child and beast,
And yet could fiercely grasp the sword.

This is he, who, awkward and songless and made the butt of jests, leaving the feast "strode to his cowhouse in the mead"—

Displeased, though meek, and muttered, "Slow of eye!
My kine are slow: if rapid I, my hand
Might tend them worse." Hearing his step, the kine
Turned round their horned fronts; and angry thoughts
Went from him as a vapour. Straw he brought,
And strewed their beds; and they, contented well,
Laid down ere long their great bulks, breathing deep
Amid the glimmering moonlight. He with head
Propped on a favourite heifer's snowy flank,
Rested, his deer-skin o'er him drawn. Hard days
Bring slumber soon. His latest thought was this:
"Though witless things we are, my kine and I,
Yet God it was who made us."

As he slept,
Beside him stood a man Divine, and spake:
"Cædmon, arise and sing." Cædmon replied,
"My Lord, I cannot sing; and for that cause
Forth from the revel came I. Once in youth
I willed to sing the bright face of a maid,
And failed; and once a golden harvest-field,
And failed; and once the flame-eyed face of war,
And failed again." To him the man Divine:
"These themes were earthly. Sing!" And Cædmon said:
"What shall I sing, my Lord?" Then answer came:
"Cædmon, stand up, and sing thy song of God."

Here is a Saxon story told mostly in sound old Saxon, and leading up from the lowly to the sublime, and thence to the triumph of the last line. Unfortunately, the venerable historian did not give future poets many opportunities like this; and Mr. de Vere, in the few he has given, shows us, sometimes in a tantalizing manner, what he could

have done with a more plastic subject. He has fulfilled his self-appointed task, and it ought to be valued as a versified account of the first period of the life of the Church in Saxon England. We have merely indicated to our readers what is the scope and aim of the "Legends," reserving a more critical examination for a later time, but not deferring our word of welcome.

The Christian Life and Virtues, considered in the Religious State. By Mgr. CHARLES GAY. Translated by the Right Rev. Abbot BURDER, O.C. Vols. II. and III. London : Burns and Oates. 1879.

THE completion of the translation, by Abbot Burder, of Mgr. Gay's very elaborate book on the spiritual life, furnishes the English reader with a treatise in many respects very unlike any which has hitherto existed in the language. Bishop Gay's work is both eloquent and philosophical. His language is lofty, copious, and often impassioned. He seeks everywhere for reasons and principles. Perhaps, indeed, there is a little too much of this research after principles. The writer sometimes begins so far away from his subject that the connection is hardly felt; and the inclination to dig deep more than once leads him to dig for very small matters. But the book is a very full and satisfying exposition of the principal virtues of the Christian, and of the religious; of their meaning, their connection with the fundamental Christian view, their practice, the defects in their practice, and the means of their acquisition. Great use is made of Holy Scripture. The sayings of the Saints, of all ages, are introduced with good effect; though we could have spared some of Mgr. Gay's exposition if he had given us a little more of the pregnant wisdom of the Bernards, the Catherines, and the Alfonsos; or if, neglecting to some extent the better-known Saints whose treatises are in common use, he had adorned his pages with more frequent citations from the modern mystics, confessors, virgins and preachers.

Books of spiritual reading are apt to be set down by some as dry, and by others as empty and unreal. As to dryness, the cause is generally what Izaak Walton would call the "complexion" of the reader. A "spiritual" book is meant, chiefly, to afford matter for recollection in God, for aspiration, and for prayer generally. For these purposes almost any book might be profitable, and almost any book unprofitable—according to the temper, age, calling, and state of progress of the reader. Bishop Gay, however, has adopted a very admirable means of averting dryness; he has filled his work with really instructive matter. He has relied on dogma and on theology. Whatever he says, he grounds on the solid rock of revelation and doctrine. We may sometimes think he "considers too closely;" but this is not a very great fault in a "spiritual" book. It would be much worse if we had empty declamation or frothy sentiment. No book can suit every reader. Some will find this work too elaborate, and will prefer something more simple. But even then he will not be able to read it without profiting by the valuable instruction of which it is full,

and being warmed by the really fine and eloquent flow of feeling and exhortation.

It has been a difficult book to translate, and Abbot Burder deserves to be congratulated. Without daring to say that the translation is perfect, we can at least assure the reader that it will be found to be a fair and perfectly tolerable rendering of a fine work.

Roma Sotterranea, or an Account of the Roman Catacombs, &c. New Edition, rewritten and greatly enlarged. By Rev. J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D., and Rev. W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A. Part Second: *Christian Art*. London: Longmans. 1879.

THE first part of this new edition of *Roma Sotterranea*—on the History of the Catacombs—was noticed, soon after its publication, in our number for April last. We have now before us the second part: a large and elegant volume on Christian Art in the Catacombs, illustrated with over a dozen chromo-lithographs executed in Rome, under the personal superintendence of De Rossi, and a large number of very good woodcuts. This second volume is itself a complete treatise on its own part of the general subject, though it occasionally refers its readers for fuller elucidation of special points, to the first volume on the History, and also the third on the Epitaphs—which last was published previously to the first volume of the present edition.

Whatever could be said of approval and praise of the former volume (and we spoke of it in April with the admiration we felt it deserved), can readily be repeated of this. The text, both carefully compiled as to its facts, from De Rossi's researches, and written with much elegance, not only gives, as the preface remarks, "more abundant information" on the subject of Christian Art, "than has ever before appeared in the English language," but gives it in a systematic form which makes it pleasant reading and easy of reference. These advantages, added to that of the high place the authors have deservedly taken as authorities on their subject, will recommend this magnificent work more efficaciously than could any praise of ours. It will be to better purpose if we give an outline of the contents of the second part before us.

The volume is divided into five Books: the First Book contains three preliminary dissertations on the antiquity of early Christian Art, on the relation between it and Pagan Art, and on its symbolical character. Book II. is headed: "Subjects of Paintings in the Catacombs," and its three chapters on the symbolical, liturgical, and biblical paintings are, we can affirm, of intense interest. We find that the symbolism of the early Fathers—pushed, as we may sometimes think it, to extremes, and insisted on so seriously—was not more frequent or detailed than that of the catacombs in the ages of persecution. Indeed, the Fathers not only inherited theirs from earlier traditions, but would appear in some passages of their works to have been inspired by the actual study of the same subterranean pictures, which the authors of the present volume either interpret or the interpretation of which they support, by an appeal to those passages. Thus the symbolism of the Patristic writings

goes back through the catacombs to an apostolic antiquity. To take one example out of many which this volume furnishes, we may instance the representations of a fish, as a symbol of Christ (p. 57). It is one of the earliest symbols, and of frequent use during the ages of persecution. Expressing, as the ΙΧΘΥΣ did, the name of "Jesus Christ the Son of God and the Saviour," it became, "a sacred *tessera*, embodying with wonderful brevity and distinctness a complete abridgment of the creed." Tertullian (*de Bapt.*) speaks of "Jesus Christ our fish;" Origen, of our Lord as "figuratively called the fish." To St. Jerome He was prefigured by the fish taken with the coin in its mouth, and again by the fish whose "interior remedies" enlightened the blind Tobias. But the fish is found in the catacombs not only alone, but frequently in connection with other symbols of which it affords an easy interpretation. A picture (p. 66, and plate xvi.), of a swimming fish bearing on its back a basket of bread—not bread of the ordinary kind, but of that used in the East, and especially by the Jews as a sacred offering—with what looks like a glass of red wine in the midst of the loaves, would have seemed to the heathen intruder into the catacombs a very silly picture; but it spoke to the Christian of "the mysterious fish" our Lord, and represented to him the great Sacrament of the Eucharist. St. Jerome (*Ep.* 125), speaking of Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse who had spent all his substance for the relief of the poor, observes: "Nothing can be richer than one who carries the Body of Christ in a basket made of twigs, and the Blood of Christ in a chalice of glass." In the painting here spoken of, the basket is one of the kind mentioned—used in the sacrificial rites of both Jews and Gentiles, and, as we know from other sources, continued in use by the Christians "for carrying the Blessed Sacrament, where gold or silver could not be had." The chapter on the liturgical paintings, found in what are known as "the chambers of the Sacraments" is perhaps of the greatest importance. These are a series of pictures grouped together for the purpose of representing and teaching certain Christian dogmas—in which the symbolical, allegorical, and natural are so mixed together, that though the result is plain enough even to us, yet to an uninitiated stranger it "must always have been absolutely unintelligible." The Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist and their effects, even the Sacrifice of the Altar are here represented: more particularly the Real Presence under the Sacramental species—both by symbols and under the veils of historical types in the Old and New Testaments, but so certainly and distinctly as at once to fix the faith and practice of the early martyrs as that of the Catholic Church of to-day. This is very far from being any surprise to us, but it brings, nevertheless, a feeling of consolation and triumph. And it is easy to see that men who belong to Churches, "reformed after the simplicity of the primitive," should strive to prove either that we mistake the antiquity, or misread the significance of these dogmatic "Sermons in Stone" around the first martyrs. Hence, the authors observe: "The subject of Early Christian Art has been unhappily the battle-field of religious disputes." As to the meaning hidden under symbol or allegory, or prefigured by Biblical types, the tone in which the authors utter their convictions,

although necessarily polemical (for the Catholic interpretation of the paintings has been assailed on all sides), is throughout so dignified, and they repeat argument, example, and text with such constant patience, to the exclusion of all acrimony or mere dogmatising, that an unbiassed reading of their work must almost force conviction.

Book III. arranges the paintings chronologically, and thus answers the objection that their antiquity has been misconceived. It has been recently asserted by a writer in this country that "fully three-fourths of the paintings in the catacombs belong to the latest restorations of the eighth and ninth centuries," and that the few of the second and third "are not of religious subjects at all, and might as well be the decorations of a Pagan tomb as of a Christian catacomb." De Rossi gives "the most unqualified contradiction" to this sweeping statement; and he has specially devoted himself to the accurate determination of their chronology. The authors tell us that decisive criteria of the age of the catacombs and of their decorations are more frequent than is generally supposed; indeed, that, as De Rossi has proved, "Christian Art has a far higher antiquity than was formerly suspected." Some monuments in the cemetery of Callixtus were found to belong to the third century; afterwards others, "unmistakably better and older," were examined, and are now known to be of the second century. Even monuments of the Apostolic age "undoubtedly exist. Some have still to be sought for; but others are already known and may be visited in the Via Appia, on its neighbour the Via Ardeatina, and on the Via Salaria" (p. 120). We learn, too, that some of the most important (dogmatic) paintings, especially the best symbolical representations, gradually ceased after the age of the persecutions.

Book IV. treats of "Early Christian Sculpture;" and Book V. of "Objects found in the Catacombs." The latter includes miscellaneous articles, such as cameos, bracelets, toys, labels for slaves, domestic utensils, &c.; and sacred objects, such as glass chalices and patenæ; and, lastly, the phials stained with the blood of the martyrs, which have played an important part in distinguishing the resting places of those who shed their blood for the faith. The explanation of the gilded glasses found in the catacombs opens up many interesting points—perhaps the most interesting, controversially, is the glimpse they give us of the primitive view of St. Peter's office and dignity. A frequent representation both in painting and sculpture is of St. Peter as Moses striking the rock (suggested by St. Paul's: "The rock was Christ"), from which flows the stream of grace for "the new Israel of God" (p. 313, *et seq.*). In many cases, too, St. Peter is represented with the rod of power in his hand, with which he is represented striking the rock; and which is never figured in other hands except those of Moses and of our Lord.

The rod, the emblem of Divine power, belongs primarily and by inherent right to Christ, the Eternal Son of God. By Him it was of old delegated to Moses, of whom God testified: "He is the most faithful in all My house." For a few years the rod of power was visibly wielded by the Incarnate Word; and when He withdrew His own visible presence from

the earth, "afterwards," to use the words of St. Macarius of Egypt, "Moses was succeeded by Peter, to whom is committed the new Church of Christ, and the new priesthood."

Thus, on a sarcophagus of supposed date, A.D. 410 (plate xxiii.), in the upper portion our Lord is represented with the rod in His hand changing water into wine, and multiplying the loaves, and beneath is sculptured St. Peter (marked by the cock at his feet) with the same rod of power in his hand!

A vast amount of learned research, interesting to both the archæologist and the student of Christianity, will be found systematically arranged in this admirable volume.

The Scientific Value of Tradition. A Correspondence between Lord Arundell of Wardour, and Mr. E. Ryley; with a Letter from the Rev. H. Formby on "The Christian Science of Tradition." London: Pickering and Co. 1879.

THERE can be no doubt about the importance of the object which Lord Arundell seems to have made the purpose of his life—the construction of an orderly and exhaustive "science" of the traditions of the human race. He is not the first, and he does not pretend to be the first, to see that modern researches in ethnology and philology, whilst they have furnished unbelievers with their most effective weapons, really place in the hands of a Catholic a most efficient means of proving both the fact of primitive Revelation and the facts and events which Revelation embodies. A "science," understood as it now commonly is, means nothing but an orderly exposition of facts, embracing chiefly three heads—viz., classification as to order of time, classification as to cause and effect, and (if the science in question is pressed into the service of a higher science) classification in groups for purposes of proof. No Catholic thinker could do us a greater service than diligently to collect all the traces of revealed facts which are to be found among the traditions of the races of mankind, to sift them, to bring out their full meaning, to compare them one with another, and to show their bearing on Catholic truth. One great advantage of such a labour would be the possession by Catholics of a formidable body of proof for Revelation, such as no scientific man could refuse to look at. Another advantage would be that when, in particular cases, particular parts or specimens of Tradition had to be referred to, the Catholic apologist would know what to accept and what to reject, and not play into the hands of an acute enemy by parading exploded facts or unscientific conclusions.

The book before us is mainly taken up with an inquiry, by Lord Arundell, into the amount of evidence, direct and indirect, which exists that we are the descendants of Adam and Eve (pp. 38-106). This inquiry is interesting, but its treatment is necessarily fragmentary, both because the subject is too vast for the space, and because Lord Arundell turns aside every page or so to attack M. Max-Müller. As a specimen, however, of what Lord Arundell could do, these pages are

full of promise; and we may hope that he will devote himself to an exhaustive work, neglecting opponents, amassing facts, and putting the facts in order. He must have already collected a large quantity of materials, to judge by what he has done in his larger work on "Tradition." The book before us rather suffers from its divided authorship. Both Mr. Ryley and Father Formby have interesting things to say, and in some respects they see farther than the most of us. But a small book of 180 pages is not a large enough area to exhibit each of them in pursuit of his several views and theories. No subject is really thought out or done justice to, and the reader is rather confused when he ought to be impressed and informed. The "Scientific Value of Tradition" is also rather a misnomer. The book really consists of one valuable chapter of Christian tradition, imbedded in some useful but desultory chit-chat on the importance of Tradition, and on several other subjects.

Arguments for Christianity. Delivered by ARCHBISHOP VAUGHAN in St. Mary's Pro-Cathedral, Sydney. Sydney: E. F. Flanagan. 1879.

THESE five Lenten Lectures by the Archbishop of Sydney are welcome contributions to a literature which is not as strong as it ought to be—the literature of modern Catholic "apologetic." It is always a much easier matter to attack truth than to defend it; and therefore it happens that for one article or lecture in defence of Revelation, there are always ten against it. Besides, a defender of Revelation must write to the occasion; he must refute a given man, or show up a particular work; and therefore our apologetic literature comes to be very fragmentary and unconnected. The lectures on Man, on Belief, on Unbelief, &c., are eloquently written, but they are also full of matter—of really telling argument, of effective and sometimes original points, of bright quotation, and of useful citation from the writings of adversaries. They will be useful not only to the average reader—to heads of families who are troubled with modern novelties and want to understand them in as brief a time as possible, to young people who are in danger of being led away by "articles" and "lectures," but also to hard-worked priests who have little leisure to study the original sources of infidel discussion.

Archbishop Vaughan, on the occasion of the lecture on "Man," was attended, among others, by a black boy, of about twelve, in cassock and surplice. This boy, "Bobby," whose photograph is at the beginning of the copy of the lectures now before us, afforded the Archbishop the opportunity of one of the most powerful argumentative movements of the series. He brings forward this native boy to prove by example that man cannot be a development of a beast. We must extract the greater part of this interesting passage.

Allow me to bring before your attention a living argument in favour of the truth of what I say. If it could be proved that the most degraded type of man, the lowest form known, possessed qualities and charac-

teristics which are common to him with all civilized men, and which animals do not possess; if it could be shown that he was thus cut off from the brute creation by profound radical differences; surely it would reasonably follow that he would also differ in his origin from irrational nature; being radically different and *sui generis* his faculties and powers, he would reasonably be conceived as different, not merely in degree, but in *kind* from the brute creation. Now, which is generally looked upon as the lowest type that has yet been discovered? According to Mr. Mivart, a very high authority—and I believe his view is generally adopted by those who have had much experience of savage life in various parts of the globe—the aborigines of Australia exhibit the lowest form of humanity that has yet been found. . . . And of all Australian tribes the most savage and inhuman are those who dwell in the North, about the Gulf of Carpentaria. . . . Fortunately, I am in a position to prove to you, by a practical demonstration, that this lowest race amongst mankind does possess such qualities as all men are endowed with, and which all irrational animals lack. I have but to give you the history of "Bobby," the little black boy, who accompanied me this evening, dressed in cassock and surplice, into your presence. This little blackboy, who is now going through his studies with the Marist Brothers, of S. Patrick's, represents the living argument to which I refer. When I first arrived in this colony it happened that a man came to the Vicar General's office and asked if he could see me. I had an interview with him. He told he was going home, having been very successful in digging for gold in the north of Queensland. But there was one difficulty in the way. He had brought down a little black child from the Gulf of Carpentaria, whose parents had died or had been killed. He had brought the child to Sydney; and as he thought it would probably die of cold if taken to England, he was anxious to find some one who would be willing to take the child and keep it, and be kind to it. And having heard my name he made so bold, he said, as to ask me to do this act of charity. I consented, on the condition that I should see the boy first, so as to make sure that he was not a white boy with a black face. I think the child must then have been about five or six years old. Here he is before you. Now, this child had been brought straight down from the Gulf of Carpentaria. He came fresh and clean from his native forest; and would bring with him in his person the genuine and unadulterated characteristics of that savage tribe to which he was said to belong. Here, then, was a living example, exhibiting itself in all its native reality, of the lowest and most savage type of humanity that is extant on the earth. And not only a living example, but one in the first years of existence, with merely the germs of its powers in any exercise; and almost rudimentary in his development of body and mind. Now, what did I find in this young specimen of an aboriginal Australian? . . . He was human, and rational, and intelligent, and as much the child of human parents as any child that has ever been born. . . . He had a sense of duty, and knew the difference between duty and pleasure; he knew the difference between right and wrong, between justice, of which he had a very keen sense, and injustice; and seemed penetrated with religious ideas, especially with regard to a Divine Being and future reward and punishment (pp. 36-38).

Mary Aikenhead: her Life, her Works, and her Friends. By S. A. Dublin: Gill and Son. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

Mrs. Ball, Foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Ireland and the British Colonies. A Biography. By WILLIAM HUTCH, D.D. Dublin: Duffy. 1879.

THESE two interesting biographies have several curious points in common. They both relate the lives of Irish ladies who have founded what are virtually Irish Institutes; they both give a minute and animated picture of Irish Catholic society as it was at the beginning of this century; in each of them the principal figure, next to the heroine, is Archbishop Murray; and they both bring before their readers—perhaps, before many readers for the first time—a congregation of religious women whose history is in some respects without a parallel in these islands—the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary at York.

Each of these biographies is full of interesting reading, and no Catholic household should be without them. Dr. Hutch, in his life of Mrs. Ball, illustrates his subject in the most attractive manner; and the chapters in which, for instance, he gives sketches of Catholicism in India, and in other foreign missions, are really able contributions to missionary history. In the hope of being able to return to the subjects of these memoirs at some not far distant time, we reluctantly content ourselves with this brief recommendation.

Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis, Auctoribus Presbyteris S.J., e domo B.V.M. sine labe concepta ad Lacum. Tomus quintus. *Acta et decreta conciliorum, quæ ab Episcopis Germaniæ, Hungariæ et Hollandiæ ab anno 1789, usque ad 1869 celebrata sunt.* Friburgi-Brisgovia, sumtibus Herder, 1879.

THE harder the blows administered by the recent German legislation to the Society of Jesus, the more we admire the activity developed by its members during their exile. The great religious order being deprived of the opportunity of cultivating in Germany the field of missionary work, resumes with unwearying zeal the literary pursuits by which it has been distinguished from its very first period. Not less than five bulky volumes are now before us, containing the decrees of those Councils held after Trent which are not contained in the collection of Harduin. Volume I. gives the Councils held from 1682 to 1789 by the Bishops *ritus latini*; Volume II. those convened in the same time by the Bishops of the Oriental rite; Volume III. the French Councils from 1789 to 1869; Volume IV. the Councils of North America and the British Empire. The concluding volume is intended to give the Vatican Council, whilst Volume V., just published by Herder of Freiburg, presents us with the Councils of Gran (1858), Vienna (1858), Cologne (1860), Prague (1860), Colocza (1863), and Utrecht (1865). Besides the Councils, their decrees approved by the Holy See, and all acts anteceding and following the assembling of the Bishops, we have

those meetings of the Austrian, Prussian, and Bavarian Bishops and the prelates of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, by which they vindicated the rights of the Church against the encroachments of the State, and briefly discussed those important questions which were afterwards to be fully treated in the Provincial Councils. We may be allowed to call the attention of the Catholic clergy in England to the deliberations of the Bavarian Bishops concerning the Catholic character of the elementary schools. Volume V., like the foregoing volumes, is distinguished by three great excellencies: completeness, exactness, and usefulness. Following their great predecessors, Harduin and Bollandus, Father Gerhard Schneeman, the principal editor, and his able companions, have spared no labour to enrich the volume with good *indices*; we find seven of them, and we do not hesitate to declare the *index rerum* a masterpiece. It is needless to say a word on the importance of this collection. No bishop in the administration of his diocese, no professor of theology, no public library, and especially no one teaching Canon Law can be without this most valuable collection. All the important questions by which Catholic Germany has been so deeply agitated for almost ten years are here resolved. Let me instance only one—the Pope's Infallibility. There is not to be found one Council which does not refer to it in the strongest possible terms. The Council of Cologne says (p. 312), “Ipse (Papa) est omnium Christianorum pater et doctor, cujus infidei quæstionibus per se irreformabile est judicium.” On other topics, such as the necessity of cultivating philosophical studies, of holding in high esteem the great scholastics of the Middle Age, the dangers involved in mixed marriages, the sanctity of clerical life, we can here only touch. It was a comparatively peaceful and happy period for the Church in Germany, when she was allowed to build hundreds of churches, to erect seminaries, to institute hospitals and asylums and to cultivate Christian art. Nowadays her situation is unfortunately totally altered, but the consequences of this change have proved disastrous not to her alone, but even more to the State and to society. The Fathers of the Society of Jesus, by publishing this most important work, have highly deserved of the Church not only in Germany, but all over the world.

Other Gospels, or Lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. By WILLIAM HUMPHREY, S.J. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

THIS little book is not an exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, but a series of considerations on the claims of the Catholic Church—the line of thought being suggested by portions of that epistle. The object of the author is to set clearly forth the true doctrine as to “the Apostolic character and office of the Incarnate Word;” because he considers that difference of belief on this point is a radical cause of the separation between all forms of non-Catholics and the one Church. The nature of the apostleship which St. Paul claims for himself (Galat. i. 1), is shown to be that he was *sent* by Christ; hence, it is concluded, an Apostolic Church must be

sent by Christ;—"as the Father sent Me, so send I you." And as St. Paul repudiates and anathematizes any but the one gospel he is sent to teach—"another gospel, which is not another" (Galat. i. 6)—so should the Apostolic Church even in this day; for the mind of Christ does not change, and she must teach what He has taught her, just as He himself said: "My doctrine is not Mine, but His who sent Me." And the author inveighs warmly (p. 51) against the spurious charity so common in this generation, and which is really the offspring of indifference. He writes throughout in a clear style and with great earnestness. It is the last characteristic, more perhaps than anything else in the volume (save its lucid exposition of Catholic truth), which will tell for good, and help the inquiring and doubtful—for whom he publishes it—"towards the possession of that 'peace of believing' which springs from 'the obedience of faith.'"

The Condemnation of Pope Honorius. An Essay, republished and newly-arranged from the DUBLIN REVIEW. With a few Notes in reply to Rev. E. F. Willis. By W. G. WARD, D.Ph. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

DR. WARD has here reprinted, as a pamphlet, three Articles on the important question of the condemnation of Pope Honorius, which he originally published in the DUBLIN REVIEW about ten years ago. He tells us that he has always looked forward to combining them into one Essay, in which the whole of the argument should be preserved whilst the special controversy which led to their being written should be omitted. The fact that a Rev. E. F. Willis, of Cuddesdon College, has recently published a *brochure* on the same subject* makes this republication extremely well-timed. It is true that Dr. Ward does not profess to reply to Mr. Willis, and only refers to him in a note here and there. But to any one who reads and takes in Dr. Ward's argument, Mr. Willis's strictures will be harmless indeed.

The vital point of the Honorius question is the fact and mode of that Pope's condemnation. But the most interesting question is the exact sense of the language which he himself used. In regard to Honorius's condemnation, Dr. Ward shows as clearly as an historical point can be shown, that although the two hundred bishops of the Sixth General Councils did brand Honorius as a heretic, yet the Holy See has never confirmed that censure; but, on the contrary, whilst severely animadverting on Honorius's *negligence*, has always studiously separated his name from the heretics with whom the Council had classed him. This can only be demonstrated by careful details, and for these we refer the reader to Dr. Ward's Essay (which, as will be observed, he has enabled us to distribute to every subscriber to this Number of the DUBLIN REVIEW).

* "Pope Honorius and the New Roman Dogma." Rivingtons.

As to what Honorius really taught or meant, there are two opinions among Catholic theologians and divines. Dr. Ward, with Archbishop Dechamps, Archbishop Kenrick, and Cardinal Manning, maintain that he teaches perfectly orthodox doctrine throughout his two letters. On the other hand, Hefele and Pennacchi consider that his language was heretical whilst his thought was orthodox. There is no doubt that, in one sentence, Honorius seems to talk absolute heresy; for he says, in so many words, "*Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*" Mr. Willis makes a great deal of this. And yet, to a calm inquirer, reading the context carefully, there is nothing more clear (it seem to us) than that this very sentence is perfectly orthodox, as it stands in the Pope's letter. The context proves beyond any doubt that Honorius is here proclaiming, not the unity or identity of the human and the divine will, but the despotic power of Our Lord's *rational* will (or perhaps *personal* will) over his lower nature, in which He differed from other men, who suffer volitions or impulses which they cannot check or despotically regulate. No doubt Honorius misapprehended the point of St. Sophronius's "two wills" and Sergius's "one will." No doubt, again, he afterwards refers to the question of the distinction of the divine and human wills, and equally disapproves of the expressions "two wills" or "one will," which was material negligence. But as Hefele insists, his premisses all through are perfectly orthodox; and there is certainly no formal heresy in any conclusion he draws. Dr. Ward argues to this effect at length (pp. 38 *sqq.*), giving an interesting account of the Monothelite heresy itself. He thus sums up:—

Honorius had not the slightest or the most rudimental knowledge of the Monothelite heresy, nor any suspicion whatever of Sergius's real drift. And we are thus able to understand the fault for which he was afterwards anathematized. As we understand the matter, that fault was twofold. Sergius's letter was most carefully worded indeed; still it contained one or two expressions which were indubitably Monothelistic; yet these did not awaken the Pontiff's suspicion. Then, secondly, even if Sergius had avoided even the slightest indication of his heresy, it was still Honorius's duty not to take Sergius's statement of the case for granted, but to investigate through trustworthy persons the true theological phenomena of the East. He lamentably failed to perform this duty, and by his failure brought down on the Church a heavy calamity (pp. 43, 44).

The real way for a candid student to get to the bottom of this question of Honorius's "heresy" is to read his letters, and to study them, not in the light of posterior history, but from the standpoint of the actual position of ideas and phrases when he wrote. To any such inquirer Dr. Ward's admirable analysis of these letters (pp. 44 *sqq.*) will be of the greatest service.

As for Mr. Willis, whose pamphlet is before us, it is hard to have patience with him. Like too many of his cloth and school, he assumes throughout that Catholic teachers and disputants are conscious, or half conscious, that Papal Infallibility is a lie, and that they deliberately set themselves to gloss, suppress, and falsify history in order to support it. He makes no attempt to analyse Pope

Honorius's first letter; he lays the greatest stress on the expression "fatemur unam voluntatem," though a schoolboy could have told him it is not to his purpose; he misquotes, or at least never alludes to the Greek reading of, a critical sentence—that in relation to the "profane betrayal;" he misrepresents a most important passage of Petavius; and, above all, he never either examines what Catholics mean by an *ex cathedrâ* definition, or says clearly that no Council is held to be œcumenical beyond the degree to which its definitions are approved by the Holy See. He is answered abundantly by Dr. Ward; but his offensive assumption of a monopoly of truth and honesty is unworthy of high-class controversy.

The Catholic Church and the Kaffir. A Brief Sketch of the Progress of Catholicity in South Africa, &c. By the Right Rev. Dr. RICARDS, Bishop of Retimo and Vicar-Apostolic of the Eastern Vicariate of the Cape Colony. London: Burns and Oates. Dublin: Gill and Son. 1879.

THE zealous Vicar-Apostolic of Eastern Cape Colony has resolved on helping the work of civilising and Christianising the Kaffirs, by establishing among them a monastic colony. The monastery played a large part in humanising the newly-converted European nations; and one may study to-day the magnificent work being accomplished in North Africa by the Trappist monks of Staouëli near Algiers. Dr. Ricards proposes to do the same great work for the South African Kaffirs—"to found an institution of Trappist monks who will teach these interesting and well-disposed people how to cultivate the soil, and all the trades connected with agriculture." Much time and patience will be required, he says, to root out the evil weeds of paganism, bad government, and social abuses; and so prepare the soil for the seed of the Divine Word; but he believes—we think rightly—that the Cistercian monks of La Trappe are the men for the emergency. They have already been "the pioneers of African civilisation" in Algeria: why should they not be the same in Zembuland? The Bishop has frequently pressed his wish on the attention of the Cape Government. Quite lately he "set forth his views to the present excellent and large-minded Governor, Sir Bartle Frere, the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Sprigg, and the leading members of the Cabinet." He has been promised a tract of excellent land in the vicinity of Dordrecht, and in the midst of the Zambookies, for a Trappist monastery and farm. He asks all who read his little book to pray for the success of his arduous work; and he reminds Europeans, naturally enough, that he will require large funds to carry out his plans. His little flock at the Cape have been already almost overburdened. We heartily recommend his intensely interesting little book to all: it is sold for the benefit of his mission, and the perusal of it will show how glorious and truly apostolic a work of missionary enterprise is already begun in South Africa. The early chapters contain a lucid and, of course,

authentic account of the history, laws, customs, and superstitions of the Kaffirs. This is specially attractive at the present moment.

The Life of Saint Colette, the Reformer of the Three Orders of St. Francis, &c. By MRS. PARSONS. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

MRS. PARSONS'S former works led us to anticipate that this life by her would be both attractively written and its materials well-arranged. We are not disappointed. It is a charming book: the history of a mediæval saint, full of old-time characters and quaint incidents that are here grouped and sketched with a vigorous, clear, and always pleasant pen. It goes at once to swell the list (now, happily, increasing rapidly) of first-class English Catholic literature—of books on history, theology, or biography, that for style, ability, and critical power bear comparison with similar books around us from non-Catholic authors, and for healthy mental and spiritual food are infinitely above them. There have been not a few lives of Catholic Saints lately written by Protestant authors. Some of them have been written with much charm of style; most, if not all of them, with an honest desire to be fair to our religion and its teachings. But if a Saint's life written by a Saint is the perfection of hagiography, one written by a Protestant is sure, on essential points, to be nearer the other extreme. Compare—for an example taken at random—with this Catholic life of S. Colette, Canon Perry's "Life of S. Hugh," lately published, wherein the Saint's miracles are banished altogether to a suspicious appendix!

The great work to which God was to call S. Colette was the reform of the children of S. Francis to their first spirit and observance. But she was utterly unconscious of this until the time had almost arrived for her to act. Meanwhile, by the advice of a holy priest, she chose the life of a recluse—a life which by its vow of perpetual solitary enclosure seemed to shut her out from all chance of working for any good but her own sanctification. Mrs. Parsons thinks we shall see no more recluses; they are one of the good things of old, which "cannot live with the altered customs of the world, and the changed manners of mankind." Whether this be so or not, the description she here gives of the intrepid courage of this young heroine is a salutary warning against "the increasing captivity to human respect" of our own times. Chapter VIII. which relates the ceremony of immuring the self-sacrificing girl within the walls of her confined hermitage, and the succeeding chapters which tell us of her saintly life there, and her powerful influence on the world without, are perhaps the most interesting portions of the volume. S. Colette's life was thrown among days of trouble to the Church, days of the Anti-Popes, of confusion, lawlessness, and much neglect of religion. But people had faith and longed both to know and to do better; they thronged in crowds around the small *grille* at her hermitage to learn from her, to be guided, to be comforted. She heard them and replied, much against her will, but through obedience.

Seeing clearly at length the work of reformation to which God called her, she was dispensed from her enclosure by the Legate at Paris of the Anti-Pope Benedict XIII. People could not then sift evidence and discover which was the true Pope; they only troubled themselves to obey, and the rule they followed was to side with their pastors. France obeyed Benedict, so consequently did S. Colette. God had revealed much to her, but not this question of legality; only after the Council of Pisa did she know, when all the world learned, that Benedict XIII., whom she had hitherto obeyed was an usurper, and then in the same spirit of obedience (which was more certainly from God than special revelations) she bent herself to Alexander V. But the schism had been "a sorrow in her heart" from her very infancy. Her reform of the Poor Clares dates from the Bull of the Anti-Pope Benedict, of 16th October, 1406, in which he confers on her the dignity and power of Abbess over all who should embrace her return to the primitive rule of S. Francis.

How severe to flesh and blood was the monastic life which she re-established is known to those who have read the life of S. Francis of Assisi—a pleasant sketch of which forms Chapter VI. of this work. Exemptions from so severe a rule were early sanctioned by the Holy See, and exemptions had become the rule. "In the first house of the novitiate, the Rule of S. Clare was carried out with such fervour as to make a life of happiness which may truly be called heavenly." The story of the Saint's personal sufferings, inflicted by herself or by others, is too long to be even outlined here; one anecdote will tell enough. When asked once, "What would be the severest pain that could be sent to her," she replied, "It would be to pass a day without having anything to suffer for my God."

S. Colette added to a life of unsullied innocence the mortifications of the greatest penitents. She was a child of S. Francis, too; we are therefore not surprised to read stories of the friendliness to her, and familiarity, of the animal creation, very like those told of her great Spiritual Father. The following account of one who lived a perpetual fast, for the most part on bread and water, is interesting:—

There are some very remarkable things said of the delicacy to which her senses had attained. She found in her spare, plain diet—bread, water, a little fruit or vegetables, and sometimes fish—peculiarities of which other persons were not aware. She found a sweetness in bread which gratified the palate, though the same bread to others had no pleasant taste. She found in water as much variety as some, perhaps, would find in wine. She knew the difference between the water from the vine-growing land and the spring from the pure rock. She disliked the larger fish. What would be called tasteless things would have for her a purity of which she was agreeably sensible and which claimed her preference.

The Saint died on 6th March, 1447, having lived upwards of seventy years a heroically virtuous, self-sacrificing life. Mediæval thus both in date and spirit, she is a Saint of our century by two titles more especially—for the Saints are for all time. First, though devotion to her went on increasing through the centuries since her death, her

canonization was constantly delayed. At length she was canonized by Pius VII. in 1807. And, secondly, the work of her reform lives on still—the Saint prophesied it would live on—and the strict penitential, prayerful life she taught her daughters, the Colettines, is still practised by them. They first came into this country in 1850, and there are at this moment four houses of them in England—one at Baddesley, in Warwickshire, one at Notting Hill, another at Manchester, and a fourth at York.

We thank Mrs. Parsons for her carefully-studied, gracefully-written book. She has done more than give us a book which it will be always pleasant and profitable to look into. She has reminded us of a beautiful Saint, hitherto, we fear, too little known in England, outside her own order, and she has forced us by the glorious picture here drawn to love her. She has drawn attention, likewise, to the inestimable blessing of the presence among us of convents of the Saint's spiritual children, whose intercession we shall prize and whose lives we shall esteem the more now—because they are the daughters of so wonderful a mother.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. By HENRY FOLEY, S.J. Vol. V. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

THIS, the fifth and concluding volume of the "Records of the English Jesuits," will be found, we think, to exceed in interest, if that be possible, those volumes which have already appeared. For its aim is "to develop the sufferings of the members of the English province under the severe precautions arising out of the Oates Plot and the Revolution of 1688." This aim is amply fulfilled: and we have, besides, to thank the indefatigable editor for including in his work so many biographical notices of the members of other religious orders, and of distinguished families connected with the more immediate subjects of his researches.

The account of that supreme effort of villainy and malice known as the Popish Plot with which this volume opens, is full of touching details narrated with graphic simplicity by eye-witnesses and sufferers of the wrongs and cruelties brought on the Catholics by the machinations of Oates and his numberless dupes. When the discovery of a vast "Popish Plot" was first rumoured, so great was the public fury, that the priests both secular and regular "were driven," as the "Florus Anglo-Bavaricus" tells us, "to seek such asylum as the woods could afford them, and even there the priest-hunters, as though beating cover for game, would surround them with nets and hunt them out with dogs" (p. 433). At Boscobel, the hiding-place of King Charles a few years previously, a priest of the Society barely escaped with his life, by hiding in the neighbouring woods. Father Edward Mico, the author of a well-known Manual of Meditations, was not so fortunate, or, perhaps we ought to say, was more highly favoured, for, "Oates, accompanied by a body of soldiers, rushed into his room in the middle of the night, and would have dragged him from his bed, ill as he was, had not the Spanish Ambassador (whom he served as chaplain) by his

authority and threats restrained their violence. Nevertheless, Father Mico suffered much from their brutal violence, his body was bruised by blows from the butt-end of their muskets, his room plundered, and a guard of soldiers placed at the door day and night." And yet a fellow-religious, Father Hamerton, "sometimes dressed like a gentleman, at other times in the habit of an apothecary's apprentice," found means to enter daily the cells of the prisoners, "heard their confessions and spoke as comfortably to them as occasion would permit" (p. 250). It is related by Father Prince, or Lacey, an eminently holy man, who after his arrest at Dover was thrown into Newgate, "a horrible and infamous prison, and there lay five months sick of a fever, during which all access to him was denied even to the medical attendant of the gaol," that on his death-bed he gave good proof of that loyalty of which Catholics, and most of all Jesuits, were deemed incapable, by drinking off to the health of the king a nauseous draught of medicine which all other means had failed to make him take. No wonder the doctor exclaimed, with admiration, "Am I to believe that these men are conspirators against the king's life and crown, who even in delirium will for the love of him do an act so repugnant? Sooner would I persuade myself that all of us Protestants are traitors to the king, and guilty of conspiracy" (p. 259). When such scenes were being enacted in England, it was but natural that those who were safely housed in the College at St. Omer's should seek to propitiate the Divine clemency by devout prayer and penitential fast (p. 71). Nor are we astonished at the manner of death which befell the persecuting William Bedloe. "In August, 1680, William Bedloe died, blaspheming and cursing those who had suborned him to accuse the innocent: and his tongue came out of his mouth so long, black and swollen, that it was impossible to draw it back again, to the amazement of the bystanders; and although every caution was taken to keep it a secret, nevertheless the frightful case was spread through all the city of Bristol" (p. 74).

With the reign of James II. a happier state of things began. The "Annual Letters" speak of the great progress which Catholicism was making everywhere. Of course, the Fathers of the Society took a prominent part in the missionary and educational works which the altered condition of the country demanded of them. In London, a large college was opened in the Savoy, on Whitsun Eve, May 24, 1687 (p. 267). Soon afterwards another was commenced in the heart of the city; schools were opened at Lincoln, Norwich, and York. The Bishop of Oxford proposed to give the Catholics one of the colleges in the University, and it was the king's intention to have handed over Trinity College, Dublin, to the care of the Jesuits (p. 151). The notices scattered throughout the volume with regard to the brightest era which the Church had known in England since the days of Queen Mary give evidence of a widespread Catholic movement. To this period of the history belongs the biography and vindication of the celebrated Father Edward Petre (pp. 148, 227, &c.).

From the abundance of matter regarding the fierce outbreak of bigotry which followed the Orange Revolution we can select only a

few of the more striking anecdotes. When news reached London of the anticipated landing of the Prince of Orange, the hatred of the mob for the recently-founded Catholic establishments broke out. The preachers at the Jesuits' College in the city "were interrupted by suppressed noises, then the priests were disturbed when celebrating at the altar. Soon after this the crowds gathered in front of the chapel, broke down the doors, and pelted the congregation with stones" (p. 269). No wonder that the king's ill-advised flight was the signal for a still more general outbreak, wherein "in one brief moment of time the labour of three years was ruined." The first building destroyed in London seems to have been the Benedictine Monastery at Clerkenwell, which Abbot Corker had founded; the Royal Monastery at St. James's was broken up; and throughout the country similar scenes took place. At Wigan the materials for the erection of a new church were prepared and a site for a college fixed upon when the revolution broke out, but the mob "destroyed to the foundations all that had been raised, and scattered it to the winds" (p. 319). The accounts preserved to us of the heroism of the Fathers of the Province are full of edification. Take, for instance, the case of Father Lewis Sabran, chaplain to the infant Prince of Wales. His own account of the adventures which befell him is one of the most valuable pieces which this volume supplies. Father Sabran was trying to make his escape in the company of the Polish Ambassador, "passing as his secretary, dressed in the Polish fashion;" but was seized, together with the Ambassador, at Deptford. "One person in the crowd levelled his musket at me," he writes, "but it missed fire, having flashed in the pan." At Rochester, the inn where he was staying was attacked by the crowd; "the clock had just struck nine A.M., on hearing which one of the ringleaders roared out, 'I'll kill this Jesuit with my own hands, though I should know for certain that both myself, my wife, and family would have to pay for it upon the gallows.' Uttering this threat he wielded a huge pair of tongs with all his strength and dashed in the door, and with the rest rushed into the room. After commending myself to God, I rose up and mildly expostulated with them upon this brutal conduct towards a man, an entire stranger to them, whom they had never seen before. At first they were taken aback, and hesitated, but for a moment only, when one of them levelled me by a violent blow (with a blacksmith's hammer) upon the chest, which was a signal for all to rush upon me, strip me to the shirt, and plunder me of all I had" (p. 293). In the same neighbourhood, Father Thomas Kingsley, or de Bois, chaplain to Lord Teynham, "betook himself to the woods, where he lay concealed by day amidst constant rains, and nearly perished by the cold and hunger." In Lancashire, Father Clement Smith, after an almost miraculous escape from a mob of three hundred men, was forced to hide himself in a wood, "where he remained fasting the whole of that day, suffering much from intense frost and the snow which covered the ground." Frequently in the darkness of the night he was obliged to cross on foot through fords or passes, rendered exceedingly dangerous by reason of the ebb-tide. . . . For whole

weeks together he was unable to procure a change of linen for fear of the pursuivants coming suddenly upon him. For three months he was compelled to lie so closely hidden that he was unable even to pace about his room, nor durst he for a whole year together use either fire or candle, lest he should be betrayed by the light. Indeed, for the space of two years he was unable to leave the house where he was charitably harboured (pp. 356, 357).

Of Father Penketh, another Lancashire missionary, it is written (p. 333), "that although he escaped death, no one will say he had not a protracted martyrdom; for, detained as he was for six years in a most confined cell, that noble arena and school of patience and long novitiate of virtue, who so able to establish a right? His cell was so constructed that it would not admit of a fire, and so he passed the six years without any, although the cold in that part of the county was intense." Equally edifying are the accounts given of Fathers Evans and Lewis, by whose patient endurance of evil for the name of Christ the prisons of Usk and Cardiff were rendered venerable. The stories of Christian equanimity which occur more than once are often somewhat amusing, as in the very modern instance of Father Moutardier, missionary at Lulworth from 1817 to 1854, told at page 802; though here the appeal of the venerable man to his young tormentors, "If you will spare my spectacles, and not break them, you may do what you like to a poor old priest," is, to our thinking, not without a share of pathos.

But there would be no end to our extracts were we to quote one-half of the passages we had marked in the perusal of this deeply interesting work. We should like to give some account of the Camp Mission at Ghent, so full is it of remarkable evidences of the truths so fruitfully preached there. The account of the heroic fortitude of some Catholic soldiers (p. 209) deserves to be better known. So, too, does the notice of the sufferings of Father Atkins, who lay a prisoner in Portugal for eighteen years (1759-1777), a victim of Carvalho's barbarity. We can but allude to the extracts from Father Reeve's history of the expulsion and transmigration of the community and scholars of St. Omer's to Bruges in 1762 (pp. 169, 170). Of a somewhat calmer, but not less real, interest are the glimpses given us of the gradual and stealthy restoration of Catholicism in the dead times of the eighteenth century. The accounts of chapel building in Lancashire—at Liverpool in 1746 and at Preston in 1762—read strangely enough in our happier times.

We need hardly say that we are deeply thankful to the zealous editor for this contribution to the too scanty list of works illustrative of the Church history of England since the so-called Reformation. Its plan, indeed, entails much repetition, which a work written on a more chronological system would have avoided; but doubtless the editor's plan of giving the history of the various colleges or districts into which the Province was divided will make the work more welcome to local historians.

Prefixed to the work is an advertisement of a new volume supplementary to the present series; a volume to contain the list of English

pilgrims to Rome during the time that the English College there was under the care of the Jesuits. May we, if it be not too late, express a hope that the list may begin at an earlier date, and include those who visited the Eternal City from the commencement of Henry VIII.'s reign? Such an assistance in tracing the subsequent history of the lesser "men and women of the Reformation" would be of immense value.

Where did King Oswald Die? A Summary of the Arguments in favour of Oswestry and Winwick. Transactions of Shropshire Archæological Society, &c. Shrewsbury: Adnitt and Naunton.

THE Paper which is here published separately was inserted in the Transactions, we are told, not only for the interest of the Shropshire Society's members, but in the hope of its being "of use to future historians." Bede and the Saxon chronicle say that St. Oswald was slain in battle with Penda, king of the Mercians, on the field of Maser (Maserfield, Makerfield, &c.), which some identify with Winwick in Lancashire, others with Oswestry. Turner, in his history of the Anglo-Saxons, says it is Oswestry; and Lingard says "most" people suppose it is Oswestry, "some" think it is Winwick.

Oswestry has its Oswald's well, but, then, so has Winwick; the old chroniclers are not explicit enough about localities; names of places have been much altered or changed since their day; the same name may have an Anglo-Saxon interpretation which suits a writer's purpose and a Welsh one quite different which suits his opponent's; and, finally, transcribers of the old MSS. seem to have played fast and loose with letters of similar outline—until who shall fix the locality with confidence? Lancashire antiquarians naturally have written in favour of their own county, Salopians in favour of theirs. The arguments on both sides are here detailed to forty-four pages' length. Mr. H. W. Lloyd is the chief champion for Oswestry, and though he begins a letter of 1873 by saying, "Learning and argument, however ingenious, have hitherto failed to set the question at rest," the editor remarks, in conclusion, that Mr. Lloyd "has the best of the argument." The arguments, philological explanation of names, and patient quotation of every known ancient authority, together forms a useful *mémoire pour servir* for historians.

The settlement of Oswestry as the site of the death of the saint does not, however, rob Winwick of its associations with him. It was his residence; and the inscription on Winwick Church certainly mentions that, but leaves the place of his death indicated as Mercelde. As to St. Oswald's well there, we read: "(it) 'has been used by the Roman Catholics up to about twenty-five years past as sacred. . . . An old man of the name of Henry Roughly, who died about 1830 at the age of seventy-five, and who lived near it the greater part of his life, informed us that an old Catholic lady was accustomed to give him three shillings in his youth to keep it clear of weeds.' . . . A

Catholic gentleman named Ashton never passed it 'without going into the field, and impressing on his forehead the form of a cross from (? with) its waters.' "

Eugène Boré, XV^e. Supérieur-Général de la Congregation de la Mission.
 Notice Biographique. 2^e Edition. Paris: A. Josse. 1879.

THE subject of this biography is perhaps not widely known in England outside his own order, but in May of last year the announcement of his almost sudden death told with the agony of a personal loss on the hearts of the Fathers of the Mission and the Sisters of Charity, the children of St. Vincent de Paul spread over the whole Christian world. Père Boré had been their Superior-General scarcely four years, but by force of his superior natural gifts, his vast acquirements, and, most of all, of his heroic sanctity, he had long been a power for good amongst them, and endeared to the hearts of all who knew him. This biographical notice of him will therefore be specially welcome and interesting to his countless spiritual children; but the life of an educated, zealous, and singularly holy priest appeals to a far wider circle than even this. The present life more particularly contains a noble lesson for Catholic laymen. M. Boré was forty years of age before he received sacred orders or entered the Congregation of the Mission, and it is his life as a layman which is specially remarkable and deserving of study. He was born in 1809, and early showed indications of unusual ability, and at eighteen years took the *prix d'honneur* in philosophy; later he had brilliant university successes. At thirty-two years of age, in the full blaze of his triumph, and with golden prospects before him, he formed the resolution of travelling into the East, partly in the cause of science, but chiefly to help in opening the way for Catholic missionaries and the extension of the Faith. In 1837 he started for Armenia, halting a half-year at Constantinople for further study of Turkish, Persian, Armenian, and other Oriental languages, in which he became a marvellous proficient. From Erzeroum he went to Tauris, and there opened a school, which he directed for a year, as a means towards gaining liberty for the Catholic religion. In 1840 he was at Teheran, and opened at Djoulfa, near Teheran, a small college. Before long even Mussulman children came to it, and it was further strengthened by the opposition of the schismatic bishop. After a year at Djoulfa, and the foundation through his instrumentality of the Lazarist Mission in Persia, he established other schools in villages around. Thus, until his fortieth year, in Armenia, Persia, Greece, the Archipelago, Palestine, Turkey—teaching, writing home scientific reports or letters to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founding schools, colleges, and missions, writing and translating into Oriental tongues works of piety and in defence of the Catholic faith—this grand layman spent himself in apostolic fashion for the Gospel of Christ. And he laboured with such success and earned such a reputation through the Christian world, that when he first consulted eminent churchmen in France as

to his entering the priesthood, they, for the most part, judged he could do more for God where he was. He applied to Rome, and Pope Gregory XVI., who regarded him as an extraordinary man and a true saint, providentially chosen for the regeneration of the East, gave him the same decision. The life of such a man, told for the most part in his own letters and journals, is pre-eminently worth reading; the spirit which animated him always, would elevate and sanctify the lives of men whose actual opportunities of work are fewer and far more lowly than were those of the saintly Père Boré.

Loca Patriciana: An Identification of Localities, chiefly in Leinster, visited by Saint Patrick and his assistant Missionaries, and of some Contemporary Kings and Chieftains. With an Essay on the Three Patricks—Palladius, Sen Patrick, and Patrick MacCalphurn—Apostles of Ireland in the Fifth Century. By the Rev. JOHN FRANCIS SHEARMAN. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1879.

THE matter of the volume before us is so varied and complicated, that in the space at our disposal we despair of giving our readers a clear idea of its character. Moreover, the title-page is unintelligible, and makes war on the author's conclusion. The work professes to be an account of the places, chiefly in Leinster, which were visited by St. Patrick; but at the same time *three* Patricks are announced, all Apostles of Ireland in the same century: one might suppose the writer meant that there was a special Apostle for Leinster. Again, the announcement of three Apostles on his title-page and in the concluding chapter is misleading. Patricius primus, or Palladius, may be put aside. Mr. Shearman himself tells us that there is "not the slightest ground for the supposition that the latter part of his history is either lost or incorporated with that of his successor, Patricius Secundus."*

The sum of Mr. Shearman's discovery amounts to this: that the biographers of St. Patrick, and the ancient historians of Ireland, either from ignorance or malice, have combined to defraud the real Apostle of Ireland of his glory, imposing another personage on the simple and credulous Irish nation. "The old writers," he tells us, "who took the literary remains of the third Patrick as the exponent and counterpart of his history, which, in fact, belonged to Sen Patrick, shut out from view the *real* apostle Sen Patrick, consigning him to obscurity, and to an almost historical extinction."†

He tells us that in his theory "nothing much has been devised,"‡ and on this point we quite agree with him, for we find his view almost identical with the exploded theories of Sir William Betham and Dr. Todd; there is nothing novel but the substitution of a new name. The former, writing in 1827, characterizes the Irish records of St. Patrick as "fabricated legends invented for the express purpose of deception; to make posterity believe they saw the substance while a

* P. 411.

† P. 434, n.

‡ Pref. p. vii.
N N 2

shadow was exhibited to their contemplation ; to give to *Palladius* the name and character of *Patricius*, and to obliterate the recollection of the latter from the minds and attachment of the grateful and affectionate Irish, by giving his name to a phantom raised at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century.* In 1864 followed Dr. Todd, who discovered that it was *Palladius* who, for the sake of Patrick, was robbed of his glory by corrupt and designing annalists and biographers.† Probably our readers are weary at the revival of what, in Mr. Shearman's words, we may style "the exploded and absurd theories of pseudo-antiquarians,"‡ and inclined to adopt the line of the Chinese with Protestant missionaries, when they beg them to agree amongst themselves before they begin to teach in China. The contempt of Mr. Shearman for his forefathers of the Patrician mythical school, expressed in no measured terms, reminds us of Hegel, who observed of his philosophical rivals that to each of them might appropriately be applied the words of St. Peter to Sapphira—"Behold the feet of them who have buried thy husband are already at the door, and they shall carry thee out."

The most interesting and conclusive arguments in support of the *Catholic* St. Patrick are drawn from his own confession and epistle, and in another Number we hope to give an account of these venerable patristic documents, whose sublime beauty almost attains to inspiration. These writings, the most sacred treasure of the spiritual literature of Ireland, on Mr. Shearman's theory, must be attributed to an impostor. In all simplicity, and in many places, with no allusion to any predecessor or pre-existing Christianity, the writer pours forth his soul in thanksgiving to God for the grace granted to him, in that "a mighty multitude should be born to God, and made perfect through me, and that a clergy should everywhere be ordained for a people newly-born in the Faith;" or thus, "Wherefore, in Ireland, they who never had the knowledge of God, and up to this time only worshipped idols and unclean things, have lately become the people of the Lord, and are called the sons of God."§ Mr. Shearman may exonerate the historians of his country ; the fraud of "shutting out from view the *real* apostle Sen Patrick" cannot be laid to their charge. It is St. Patrick himself who has consigned Mr. Shearman's hero to "obscurity, and an almost historical extinction."

Seventeen elaborate genealogical tables form an important part of Mr. Shearman's work. We find therein the names of Queen Mab or Medbh, Queen Victoria, Marshal MacMahon, Major O'Gorman, the Shearmans, &c. If the author had adopted the same plan with regard to his St. Patricks, he might possibly have preserved an undivided allegiance to his national Apostle. In the following *schema*, constructed from *his own work*, it will be seen how gently his rival Patrician currents meet and mingle in unity :—

* "Irish Antiquarian Researches," p. 245.

† "Apostle of Ireland," p. 303. ‡ P. 395, n.

§ "Confessio Sti Patricii" Villanueva, pp. 200-202.

PATRICIUS SECUNDUS.

1. Descended from Nemidh, p. 421.
2. Native of Island of Britain, p. 415.
3. Connected with Britons in Armorica, p. 415.
4. *At age of 16* captured by Irish raiders, pp. 425, 434.
5. A slave in Ireland, p. 415.
6. *At age of 22* escapes from captivity, p. 434.
7. Takes refuge in Gaul, p. 425.
8. Studies under St. Germanus, p. 415.
9. Missionary priest in Ireland before coming as bishop, p. 435.
10. Death commemorated on 17th March, p. 402.

PATRICIUS TERTIUS.

- Descended from Nemidh, p. 421.
- Native of Island of Britain, p. 415.
- Connected with Britons in Armorica, p. 415.
- At age of 16* captured by Irish raiders, pp. 425, 452.
- A slave in Ireland, p. 415.
- At age of 22* escapes from captivity, p. 452.
- Takes refuge in Gaul, p. 425.
- Studies under St. Germanus, p. 415.
- Missionary priest in Ireland before coming as bishop, pp. 450, 452.
- Death commemorated on 17th March, p. 402.

We could not believe our eyes, until we had again and again referred to the pages indicated; such an identity of fortunes, in different persons, is something new in this lawless, unruly world. Is it not easier to suppose that Mr. Shearman's two Patricks are one and the same personage?

Dramatic Idyls. By ROBERT BROWNING. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1879.

AN Idyl is, we suppose, a small picture; and a "dramatic" Idyl is one in which human feeling and passion predominate over scenery, description, or mere sentiment. It used to be held that an Idyl was necessarily a pastoral poem, after the example of Theocritus. But Mr. Tennyson has called his miniature epics Idyls, and now Mr. Browning has given the same name to his miniature dramas. Yet these are not dramatic in form, but only in spirit. Those who admire Mr. Browning will admire these poems. They are full of his power of concentrated expression and vivid painting; and they are also sometimes uncouth to a degree beyond the limits of art, not to say obscure even to darkness. Still, Mr. Browning has written things more uncouth and more obscure. In these dramatic pictures the situation is generally powerful, tragical, and pathetic. But the garb of verse flung over them is the most negligent and ill-fitting of robes. The poems remind one of a Hercules half-clad in shreds of tiger's skin. We cannot decide whether the mighty figure would look grander without the rugged robe, or whether the daring, reckless dress adds some weird power to the strong limbs and fateful face.

"Martin Relph" is a story of a man's indecision or hesitation, not without guilty motive—resulting in the death of the woman he wished for and the man he disliked. "Pheidippides" has an attic ring, but the versification is as different from that of Aristophanes as a cameo is from a gargoyle. Let us imagine how the Theatre would have stopped its ears at this:—

I am bold to believe Pan means reward the most to my mind!
 Fight I shall with our foremost, wherever this fennel may grow—
 Pound—Pan helping us—Persia to dust, and, under the deep,
 Whelm her away for ever. (P. 41.)

“Halbert and Hob” tells a tale of two wretched men, father and son, who lived like beasts, fought, went mad, and died. “Ivan Ivanovitch” is the longest and best piece in the volume. It is a story of a mother and her infants chased by wolves; and the terror and horror of the theme, the locality, and the actors, are well suited to Mr. Browning’s genius. Here is the advance of the wolves:—

Was that—wind?

There’s no mistaking more. Shall I lean—look—learn
 The truth whatever it be? Pad, pad! At last, I turn—
 ’Tis the regular pad of the wolves in pursuit of the life in the sledge!
 An army they are: close-packed they press like the thrust of a wedge:
 They increase as they hunt; for I see through the pine-trunks ranged
 each side,
 Slip forth new fiend and fiend, make wider and still more wide
 The four-footed steady advance. The foremost—none may pass:
 They are elders and lead the line, eye and eye—green-glowing brass!
 (P. 72.)

“Tray,” a short poem on a dog’s heroism, comes next, and the book concludes with “Ned Bratts,” in which the hero, a drunken, murderous, and evil-living publican, describes, in Mr. Browning’s well-known style of mingled tragedy, comedy, and grotesqueness, the conversion of himself and his equally sinful wife by John Bunyan, then in Bedford gaol, and by the reading of the “Pilgrim’s Progress.”

Luxurious Bathing: a Sketch. By ANDREW W. TUER. Illustrated with twelve folio etchings, initials, &c., by SUTTON SHARPE. London: Field and Tuer. 1879.

THIS enormous and magnificent folio is prefaced by the line of Byron—

Men really know not what good water is worth.

The work, however, is got up more in the interest of etching than of bathing. The preliminary “sketch” of bathing is not very original; as one turns over the huge folios, printed in an antique type, with a quaint antique use of italics, one comes to feel that Mr. Tuer is only stringing together his ideas on the use of soap and water in order to introduce the more substantial part of the work to follow. This consists of twelve splendid etchings of sea and river subjects, each of them illustrating a stanza of poetry. Etching is a form of art which, with most people, and in more senses than most art, requires an educated and prepared taste to appreciate its results. But for those who like to study “pure” processes, and who derive a reflected satisfaction in dwelling on successes achieved under self-denying conditions, these beautiful etchings will be attractive. There is no “bathing” in them; but the water, the foliage, and the landscape,

together with the few figures, are given with very great skill of manipulation, and with an effect as perfect as can be looked for without the assistance of the graver.

Elizabeth Eden. A Novel. By M. C. BISHOP. In Three Vols. London : Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington. 1879.

IN this charming story a problem which has of late been much before the world is faced by the heroine, who finds a fuller solution for it than, apparently, has as yet been attained by Mr. Mallock. Let us quote a passage in which Elizabeth Eden's perplexities are unfolded :

She had abundant power—her power of beauty ranking first; and because of the sickness of her thoughts it attracted more than when it was serene. She had the power of brains made active by her moral shock, and eagerly seeking for some answer to a question that haunted her, “Is life worth living?” Her old purposeless calm was replaced by stormy revolt against the crushing, inexorable folly of life. “Why?” replacing the *que sais-je* of her dreamy first existence. The answers given by the best monthly prophets and weekly scribes were no good to her. Were it ever so certain that the creeds of the multitude are but obsolete superstitions that had outlived their purpose and outlived their cycle, her lonely struggle with the suffering of life was not the easier. And if she could not accept their creed the revivalists of a moribund faith could not help her. In a church hard by her house was offered to her perhaps the best that Anglicanism can give, but she turned from its chill compromises with sick longing for a message to her and her alone from God, if there were a God, a message that would not merely gratify her taste and please her good sense, but that should overawe her, so that she should become the prisoner of its words, bound by them and possessed by their power with a complete possession, so as to escape from the tyranny of herself. . . . Except as bits of history, Mrs. Eden did not interest herself in forms of faith. The beliefs of other men were unimportant to her. The laws that work in visible matter appealed far more to her imagination, and she liked now and then to think of herself as, whatever else, certainly a manifestation of force, and certainly reducible to a few chemically-divided substances. Yet, again, she was stung by sudden remembrance that such laws, however beautiful, did not account to her for the terrible freedom of her will, or relieve her from the awful responsibilities of conscious life or from the shadow of certain death. She was too feminine to be epicurean, she was too poor to lose herself in the frivolities of amateur æstheticism, or even pretend, as she might have done, to be interested in its fashions. She was too frankly flesh and blood to observe as a spectacle the human miseries she could not relieve, so she did not attempt to do alms after the modern fashion. What remained?—Vol. iii. p. 36.

We must refer our readers to Mr. Bishop's pages to see for themselves what remained. It is a great pleasure when so many of the novels with which the British press teems are but bad imitations of bad foreign originals to turn to such a book as this, the work of a true artist, depending for its interest, not upon the excitement of morbid emotions or vulgar desires, but upon the literary skill, the

constructive powers, the taste and refinement of the author, and representing worthily the traditions of the best school of English fiction.

Pietas Mariana Britannica. A History of English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye, Mother of God. By EDMUND WATERTON, F.S.A. London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

MR. WATERTON is not only *laudator temporis acti*—which, in a zealous lover of Our Lady looking back upon Catholic England, is intelligible and pardonable—but he insists upon obsolete spellings, and has filled his book with Latin passages untranslated and with quaint Chaucerian and other old English extracts that are almost as mysterious to the ordinary English reader as Latin itself. Nothing is surely gained, and certainly the eye is offended, by constantly finding Mary spelled Marye, and Lady, Ladye. A facsimile edition, or a reprint by some Camden or Early English society has a value from its fidelity to the old spellings, but in a book intended, we presume, for general reading—and eminently deserving for its ability and erudition to be generally read—constantly recurring bits of quaint Latin, old French, and very old English, are amusing enough for once or twice, then they grow annoying, and finally they provoke us to close a book we should have liked otherwise to continue. Of course there is—we are fully aware of it—an antiquarian value in much of what Mr. Waterton cites in these pages, but we presume he has not written a book to stir up love towards our Blessed Lady exclusively or chiefly in the souls of antiquarians. When we have mastered Anglo-Saxon, Chaucer, old French, and badly-spelled black-letter texts we find that it is a really charming history, well calculated to warm hearts with new love towards the glorious Queen whose dowry this English land gloried in being. And we feel at once that we should like it to be largely read by Catholics of all sorts, by the reader in collegiate, conventual, and monastic refectories. But what is a good nun, or even a student, to make of an English text which never runs smoothly for half a page, and is ever and anon broken into with such pieces as this—chosen at first chance opening of the book? (p. 44)—

Avaunt baner without lettyng
Sant Joyrg before eny of myne,
The banere of the Trenyte, that is Haven Kyng,
And Sente Edward his baner at thys tyd,
“Our Ladye,” he sayd, “that is Haven Quene,
Myn ounne baner with her schall abyde.”

Had quotations which were valuable from the preservation of their archaic forms all been placed in notes, and good modern English substitutes placed in the text, we think this valuable book would be more widely appreciated and read than it will be as it now stands. But we hasten to say that, except for this peculiarity, there is nothing in the book that is not praiseworthy. The author has spent many

years in assiduously gathering together from numerous libraries and from little known and ancient works the materials for his history. It is a monument of zeal and ability, no less than of chivalrous love for the Blessed Virgin. Its aim is to show how completely the "Mariolatry," now so often thrown against us as a foreign and modern growth, had sunk into the soil of pre-Reformation England—even of Anglo-Saxon England—filling the thoughts and overflowing into the tenderest words of chronicler or poet, and colouring the daily life of both noble and peasant. The first half of the volume traces this ancient devotion in its various manifestations, the second half is a long catalogue of the bequests and offerings made to Our Lady's altars or shrines, and of the chapels and sanctuaries built all over England, Wales, and Scotland by devout servants of Mary. It is not possible to give in a short notice any idea of what a wealth of varied and attractive matter is accumulated in this large volume. We believe that the insight it gives us into the deep-rooted, manly, yet withal tender, devotion of English men and women for the sweet mother of our Redeemer, the beauty and sterling piety of some of their old prayers here rescued from oblivion, will do much good. It will be seen that some devotions and expressions in Her honour, suspiciously regarded as exotic forms, indiscreet ingraftments, and the like, are beautiful flowers, too delicate, perhaps, for the surrounding coldness of Protestantism and other kinds of unbelief, but which once grew readily in our Northern air and perfumed with their sweetness the work-day lives of our forefathers. Where all is interesting because of the vast amount of antiquarian learning drawn together from widely-varying sources, we may refer, as appearing to us specially beautiful and new, to the chapters on Our Lady's name, on devotion to Her in childhood and boyhood, and among sailors, on the Little Office and the Angelus. An old form of the latter is given, extracted from the *Horæ* of Sarum use of 1523 and 1534, which is exceedingly interesting. It includes a form of prayer to be said at the "tolling of the ave bell at noon, for a memory of the passion and death of Christ" (p. 145), which is so beautiful that we doubt not many priests and religious will be glad to incorporate it, in its original Latin, amongst their private devotions.

We shall rejoice very much if at a later period Mr. Waterton sees it good to make a popular compendium of the present work, retaining the most interesting and valuable portions, but so Englished as to be intelligible to the ordinarily educated man and woman.

BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING.

1. *Short Meditations for every Day in the Year.* By an ANONYMOUS ITALIAN WRITER. In Two Vols. Adapted and translated by DOM EDMUND J. LUCK, O.S.B. London: Washbourne. 1879.
2. *Spiritual Reading for Every Day.* By DOM LE MASSON. Translated and slightly abridged by KENELM DIGBY BESTE, Priest of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
3. *Month of the Sacred Heart.* By FATHER ALEXIS LEFEBVRE, S.J. Translated from the French. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
4. *The Treasury of Prayer.* Dedicated to the Frequenters of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates.
5. *The Mystery of the Crown of Thorns.* By a PASSIONIST FATHER. New York: Sadleir. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
6. *The Working of the Divine Will.* Gleanings from Père Caussade, S.J. From the French. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
7. *The Manna of the Soul.* By FATHER PAUL SEGNERI, S.J. Vol. III. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
8. *Pensées et Entretiens Eucharistiques.* Paris: Leclerc. 1878.
9. *Vacation Days; a Book of Instruction for Girls.* By the Author of "Golden Sands." London: Burns & Oates. New York: Sadleir & Co. 1879.
10. *Daily Meditations on the Mysteries of Our Most Holy Faith.* Vol. IV. Translated from the Spanish of the Rev. Father ALONSO DE ANDRADE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
11. *The Bread of Life; or, St. Thomas Aquinas on the Adorable Sacrament of the Altar.* Arranged as Meditations. (Library of the Holy Ghost.) By FATHER RAWES, D.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
12. *A Novena in Honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary.* Composed by P. PIERRE JOSEPH DE CLARIVIÈRE, S.J. Translated by the Rev. JAMES MACVEAGH, C.C.

THE two volumes of Italian meditations, which Dom Edmund Luck has translated and adapted will probably be found useful; for it is very seldom that any good and sound devotional manual does not please and help a certain number of souls. The meditations are taken in part from the *Manna dell'Anima* of Segneri. Each Meditation is headed by a text of Scripture, which forms the subject of the Meditation; and this text is treated in three points, with more unity of idea than is generally found in books of this kind. The texts are adapted to the principal seasons of the Liturgical year, and on Sundays are taken from the Liturgy itself; but on most of the week days, when no particular season or feast is being kept, they are isolated and unconnected passages. There is no attempt at devotional warmth, and only bare suggestions of *prayer* in the proper sense; and perhaps many priests will find them more useful for sermons than for private elevation of the heart to God.

2. In translating Dom Le Masson's *Spiritual Readings*, Father Beste

has given us a most excellent manual for daily prayer and thought. The book may be described roughly as the *Following of Christ* arranged in daily lessons, fortified by Holy Scripture, elucidated by St. Francis de Sales, and enforced by devout forms of prayer. There are purists who object to cutting up and portioning out a classic like the *Imitation*; and there are those who think they require no texts, points, or prayers to help them to use its heart-searching chapters. But for others, and for every priest and layman who loves to have one book, this seems to be the very book.

3. *The Month of the Sacred Heart* of Father Lefebvre is a series of thirty very devout and practical considerations on the various mysteries and virtues connected with the Heart of our Divine Saviour. The words of his various communications to Blessed Margaret Mary are, with admirable judgment, dwelt upon at length, and thoroughly used for edifying meditation. The book is full of ardour and prayer. There are passages in it which seem exaggerated, at least in expression; as, for example, the remarks about the grievousness of tepidity (p. 36, 37), and on the "agony" of the Heart of Jesus in the tabernacle (p. 184).

4. The new "Oratory" Prayer-book has been compiled by fusing together, if the word may be used, the Garden of the Soul and the *Raccolta*. There are few books of devotion better adapted for daily use, in church or at home. There is a wonderful variety of devotion in this manual, and those who like old familiar forms, or who prefer to use nothing but "indulged" prayers, will be equally able to suit themselves. One cannot have everything; but among the old-established favourites some would have been glad to find the "Universal Prayer"—a prayer by no means theoretically perfect, but which certainly has the gift of stirring simple hearts by that quasi-rythmical character which, we suspect, is more important in public or private forms of devotion, and in sermons, than most of us understand.

5. The distinguishing features of the Passionist Father's book on the *Crown of Thorns* are its full explanation of the Old Testament types, and its interesting collection of holy names and incidents in holy lives which are in any way connected with this sacred instrument of the Passion. As a spiritual reading book, and as a *subsidiary* to the Lenten preacher, the work will be appreciated.

6. The anonymous translator of "Gleanings" from Père Caussade has succeeded in producing a beautiful and touching book of mingled meditation and aspiration. Its literary form is unexceptionable, and adds not a little to the native effectiveness of Père Caussade's deeply-felt exposition.

7. There is no need to recommend the *Manna of the Soul* of Father Segneri. Perhaps there is no book in existence of the same character which is so overflowing with scriptural thought, and so rich in what our old writers call "solid" piety, by which we suppose they mean piety which regards ends rather than means, which chooses "means" simply for their effectiveness in bringing about ends, and which never loses sight of "the end," the love of God with the whole heart. The translation of the third *trimestre*, now before us, is not perfect, but it is fairly good. Segneri is, unfortunately for his translators, as genuine

a writer of Italian as Cobbett is of English, and is therefore not easy to do justice to.

8. All who are fond of French books of devotion will find a very beautiful and admirable one in these *Pensées Eucharistiques*. The book is warmly recommended by the Bishop of Basle.

9. Although *Vacation Days* contains a good deal of high-flown sentiment and some advice that might make silly girls sillier, still it is an extremely attractive book, and its counsels, its practices, its reflections, and its prayers, will be found excellently calculated to keep up in girls during their vacations that spirit of true piety which they may be supposed to have imbibed during their school-time.

10. Those who have the previous volumes of this very good translation of Father Andrade's pious meditations, will be glad to add this fourth volume. They will find in it the same fulness, unction, and fervour as in the others.

11. This book, by Father Rawes, deserves the warmest welcome. It is nothing less than a translation of the *Opusculum* of St. Thomas of Aquin, *De venerabili Altaris Sacramento*: a work which is not merely full of Scripture, divinity, and thought, but is a perfect mine of all three, and of devotion as well. It is a difficult work to present in English, or in a modern dress of any kind, because it is throughout in pretty strict scholastic form; and we may say, perhaps, that Father Rawes, if he intended to "arrange" it at all, would have been better advised to diminish the number of sections, divisions, points, and numerals, than to increase them. However, although this may interfere with the attractiveness of the work as a manual of devotion, still the wealth of the treatise is all there, and it is inexhaustible. Priest and layman may ponder and study it for many a long year without using up the half of its treasures. Father Rawes is to be congratulated on this first instalment of the "Library of the Holy Ghost."

12. The "Novena," translated by Father Macveagh, is a companion to that recently published by him in honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Devout readers will find it pious, practical, brief, and well translated.

THE
CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

An Essay,

Republished and newly-arranged from the "DUBLIN REVIEW."

WITH
A FEW NOTES IN REPLY TO REV. E. F. WILLIS,
OF CUDDESDON THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

BY
WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, D.Ph.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

1879.

EXHIBITION OF THE HONORABLE

OF THE

OF THE HONORABLE

OF THE HONORABLE

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,
GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS
LONDON, W.C.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,

(11)

PREFACE.

THE three articles, on which this Essay is founded, appeared in the "Dublin Review" for July, 1868; January, 1869; and April, 1870. They were very far from being connected with each other in the way of orderly arrangement; being in fact successive reviews of three successive pamphlets. I have always looked forward therefore to combining them at some future date into one consecutive Essay, and at the same time disentangling them from the particular controversy which occasioned their original appearance. I am now led to undertake this task without further delay, because an Anglican clergyman — Rev. E. F. Willis, of Cuddesdon Theological College—has just published a pamphlet on the subject.* I can find however no argument in that pamphlet, which has not (it seems to me) been answered by anticipation, in various Catholic treatises, and in my own articles inclusively. I have done nothing more therefore, as regards Mr. Willis himself, beyond appending a few notes, in reference to this or that statement which he has made.

The Essay contains hardly anything, which is not virtually included in the original articles. Mr. Willis's pamphlet contains no doubt various incidental remarks, which it would be interesting to discuss. In particular a great deal might probably be said concerning Pennachi's work, to which

* "Pope Honorius and the New Roman Dogma." Rivingtons.

Mr. Willis draws prominent attention, but which I have not seen. I am too busy however with other writings to attempt anything of the kind, even if I were competent to effect it. I have found it no great trouble, to re-arrange materials which I had already collected; and I have been obliged to content myself with this quasi-mechanical task. This task has (of course) necessarily led me to reconsider the whole subject. And I am bound to say I am quite as confident as I was in 1868-70, that no kind of theological difficulty is presented to a Catholic, by Honorius's condemnation and its attendant circumstances.

So large a portion of the Essay being a mere republication from the "Dublin Review," it has been a kind of necessity to retain the use of the first person plural. But in all which follows, the word "we" must be understood as simply synonymous with "Dr. Ward."

In conclusion I should explain, that the original articles were of course submitted to the three contemporary censors of the "Dublin Review"; and that the present Essay also, as it stands, has been submitted to competent censorship.

CONTENTS.

SECTION	<i>Page</i>
I. The real point of controversy	7
II. Pontifical ex cathedrâ Definitions were familiar facts at the time of the Sixth Council	9
III. No authority, which Catholics account infallible, has con- demned Honorius for teaching falsely ex cathedrâ	13
IV. It is certain that his Letters were not issued ex cathedrâ	16
V. No authority, which Catholics account infallible, has con- demned Honorius for heresy	25
VI. It is certain that his Letters are not heretical	37
VII. The anathema, pronounced on Honorius by S. Leo II., was most justly merited	56
VIII. Remarks on the whole controversy	58

THE CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

I.

WE cannot for a moment admit, that the Honorius case presents any real difficulty against the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Nevertheless it involves so many circumstances *primâ facie* startling to a Catholic, that we cannot be surprised at the stress laid on it, whether by Gallicans in time past, or by non-Catholics since the Vatican Council. Our purpose in this Essay is to exhibit the facts in what we believe to be their true light ; and to show that they cannot, without paradox and extravagance, be adduced against the dogma which they are alleged as disproving.

Now firstly, what is the defined dogma of Papal Infallibility ?

“ We teach and define that it is a divinely-revealed dogma, that the Roman Pontiff—when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when, fulfilling his office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme Apostolical authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church—through the Divine assistance promised him in Blessed Peter, is endowed with that Infallibility, with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be furnished in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals.”*

No infallibility is here ascribed to the Pope, except where he defines some doctrine to be held by the universal Church ; or (in other words) where he purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. Those who allege that the

* This Definition had not of course been drawn up, when our articles were written. But the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, assumed throughout our articles, was in most entire accordance with that subsequently defined.

case of Honorius disproves the Vatican dogma, must allege, either that Honorius set forth as obligatory on the whole Church some tenet admitted by Catholics to be false,—or else that some voice, which Catholics account infallible, has *pronounced* him so to have acted. Suppose (for argument's sake) it were proved by actual demonstration that Honorius was a formal heretic:—such a demonstration would have literally no bearing on the Vatican Decree. This is almost a truism when stated; though opponents continually forget it. The Vatican Decree neither says, nor ever so distantly implies, that a Pope may not fall into formal heresy. Nay not only the Vatican Decree does not imply this, but the strongest infallibilists do not ascribe certainty to any such proposition. There cannot be a more representative theologian, than Dr. Murray of Maynooth. He refers to this very question (*de Ecclesiâ*, d. 20, n. 108). “Can the Pontiff,” he asks, “become a formal heretic?” Bannez, Valentia, and Laymann, he tells us, answer in the affirmative; Tanner and Viva think the thing uncertain; Bellarmine and Wiggers account it probable—Suarez thinks it more probable—that God will not permit this. He cites no one theologian who considers it *certain*, that a Pope may not be a formal heretic; though he holds (most reasonably we think) that the fact of no such circumstance having occurred for so many centuries, affords much increased probability to the opinion. Lastly, Dr. Murray mentions, as admitted by all, that a Pope may fall *materially* into dogmatic error, and even into heresy.

Our own conviction is—as we shall in due course set forth—that Honorius was entirely free from the very slightest tinge of Monothelism. But any Catholic has fullest liberty to hold the opposite opinion, if he so reads the facts. Those who allege Honorius's case as disproving the dogma of Papal Infallibility, do not move one single step in the direction they desire, by adducing arguments for the heretical character of that Pontiff's Letters. As we have already

said, they must do one of two things, or they may as well hold their tongue. They must name some definite tenet admitted by Catholics to be heretical or erroneous, in regard to which they shall maintain, that Honorius set it forth as obligatory on the assent of all Christians. Or otherwise they must maintain that some authority, accounted by Catholics infallible, has declared that Honorius did so set forth some such tenet. Two different ways then are imaginable, in which the Sixth Council might assist them to their conclusion. Firstly it is imaginable, that that Council may have condemned Honorius, for teaching falsely *ex cathedrâ*; and that its utterance was of a kind, which Catholics account infallible. Secondly it is imaginable, that on the one hand the Council may have declared his Letters heretical or erroneous, in a pronouncement which Catholics are required to account infallible; while on the other hand the *ex cathedrâ* character of those Letters—though not declared by the Council—may nevertheless be manifest as a matter of fact. We will consider these two suppositions successively.

II.

When we begin however to embark on this undertaking, many opponents meet us with a difficulty at the very outset. In Honorius's time—they say—no such Pontifical pronouncement had been heard of, as those which the Vatican Council describes to be *ex cathedrâ*.* It is curious these critics should not see that, if this be their opinion, they are precluded by it from adducing the case of Honorius, in any shape whatever, as an objection to Catholic doctrine. We do not deny that their opinion, were it true, would afford them an extremely strong argument against the Vatican Definition: but we do say that

* This seems to be Mr. Willis's view. "If '*ex cathedrâ*' is used in the Vatican sense of the term, to bring it into connection with Honorius at all, is a palpable anachronism" (p. 33).

such an argument must be entirely irrespective of Honorius. If Honorius never taught *ex cathedrâ* at all, it is very certain that he did not teach *falsely* *ex cathedrâ*. We cannot however—we need hardly say—avail ourselves of so suicidal a reply as this, to the Honorius objection. We admit, of course, that the name “*ex cathedrâ*” was not in use so early. But we must maintain, nevertheless, that the thing designated by that name was among the most conspicuous of habitual contemporary phenomena. We will beg our readers’ attention, therefore, to the following facts. They all belong to a period preceding the reign of Honorius; and throughout we place in italics those words, to which we desire particular attention.

Pope S. Hormisdas required from the repentant Acacians a certain Profession, as a condition of communion. It was subscribed at the time by all the Eastern Bishops, and afterwards by all the Fathers of the Eighth Council. It begins with stating, that “to preserve the rule of right faith is the commencement of salvation.” It proceeds to lay down that, in accordance with Christ’s “*Tu es Petrus*,” “religion has ever been preserved without defilement in the Apostolic See.” “Wherefore,” it presently continues, “we *receive and approve all the Letters of Pope Leo* concerning the Christian religion” . . . “following in all things the Apostolic See, and *preaching all her Constitutions*.” (Denzinger, n. 141.)

At a later period, Pope Vigilius addressed a Letter to the Greek Emperor. In this Letter, after having recited various Letters of his Predecessors, S. Leo, S. Hormisdas, S. Agapetus, which had never been placed before any Œcumenical Council, the Pope thus proceeds:—

“With regard then to those things which have been defined concerning the Faith by the Fathers of the *four holy Synods*, and by the before-mentioned *Letters of Pope Leo of happy memory*, and the *Constitutions of our venerable predecessors*—condemning, by the authority of the Apostolic See, those who do not *follow these in every particular* (per omnia

non sequentes), and who oppose their doctrines—we *anathematize* those who shall have attempted either perversely to dispute or *faithlessly to doubt* concerning the exposition or *rectitude of that Faith*: and we sever from the unity of the *Catholic Faith* persons who think against those things concerning the Faith which are contained in *the most holy Synods* of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and in the above-mentioned *Letters of our predecessor Leo* of happy memory, or all those things *which his authority sanctioned* (Orsi, “*de irreformabili*,” &c., lib. i. c. 19, art. 2).”

Nor was this only Vigilius's *claim*: the claim was *admitted*. In the section we have just cited, Orsi draws attention to one particular part of Vigilius's “*Constitutum*.” In this the Pontiff quotes a letter, addressed to him by the Patriarch of Constantinople and by several Eastern Bishops, promising that they would in all things follow *the Letters of S. Leo* and the *Constitutions of the Holy See*, whether as regards *faith* or as regards the authority (*firmitate*) of the four preceding Councils. And the Emperor also held the same doctrine: for, as Orsi proceeds to point out, another passage from Vigilius's “*Constitutum*” proves this. Vigilius speaks with approbation of Justinian's having influenced the Bishops to put forth “*professions*” of faith, whereby they “were shown to *adhere to the Definitions and Judgments of the holy Fathers*,* and of the four venerable Councils, and of *the Bishops of the Apostolic See*.” Now it will be admitted, that every Catholic of that period regarded the definitions of those Councils as irreformable, and (in modern language) infallible. Such therefore, and no less, was the authority which Vigilius claimed, as due to those “*Definitions and Judgments of Bishops of the Apostolic See*,” which he mentions.

No historical fact then can well be more certain, than that,

* By the “*holy Fathers*” are here meant the Bishops assembled in Ecumenical Council. This is made clear through a letter presently quoted by Orsi from Justinian, in which he says that he “follows the *Constitutions of the holy Fathers, i.e. the 318 assembled at Nicæa*.”

by Vigilius's time at all events, it was a recognized and customary habit, for Pontiffs to put forth certain "Definitions," "Judgments," "Constitutions," concerning the Faith, which claimed from all Catholics absolute and unreserved interior assent. It is perfectly clear that many such then existed; and that an indefinite number were expected for the future.* An early instance of such obligatory Apostolic Letters was Pope S. Celestine's, addressed to the Third Council. He had told his Legates that they were to "*judge* on the opinions of the Bishops, not to enter into *dispute* with them." And the Bishops, in anathematizing Nestorius, declared that they had been "*compelled* thereto (*ἀναγκαιῶς κατεπειχθέντες*) by the Sacred Canons and by the *Letter* of their most holy Father and fellow-minister, Celestine." S. Leo's tome affords another conspicuous and memorable instance of these Pontifical pronouncements. Nor need we do more than hint at the volumes of controversy which have been expended, on discussing the attitude towards that *ex cathedrâ* Act, assumed by the Fourth Council. Cardinal Newman considers such Acts to have been by no means unfrequent, even in Ante-Nicene times. These are his words, the italics being our own:—

"It is a great misfortune to us, that we have not had preserved to us the dogmatic utterances of the Ante-Nicene Popes. A fragment of one of them remains; and it accidentally contains an assertion, indirect but clear, of the very doctrine we desiderate in other writers, the Eternal Existence of the Son. The portion which remains to us of [Pope S. Dionysius's] Letter, is written in a tone of authority and decision, *which became an infallible voice.*"—"Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical," p. 252.

* "*Tota mea argumentatio fundatur in duobus factis historicis, quæ proculdubio extra omnem controversiam posita sunt. . . . Primum factum. Constat ex historiâ ecclesiasticâ usque ab antiquissimâ ætate, quod Romani Pontifices sæpius . . . libellos et professiones fidei a singulis episcopis subscribendas indixerunt, vel Decreta et Constitutiones de Fide ediderunt per universam Ecclesiam, cum præcepto obediendi ad omnes episcopos directo, &c.*"—Muzzarelli, de Auctoritate Summi Pontificis, c. xii. sec. 4.

Nothing then can be more historically intelligible than the proposition, that Honorius expressed heresy or error in one of these "Constitutions," "Judgments," "Definitions." Moreover could such a proposition be established, the Vatican dogma would indubitably be thereby disproved. We are in the first instance therefore to inquire, whether the Sixth Council declared any such proposition, in any such way as would be considered by Catholics infallible.

III.

Now firstly there cannot be a more gratuitous supposition than this. You might as well say that S. Celestine, or S. Leo I., or any other Pontiff you like to name, had been condemned as teaching heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*. There is not the faintest allusion in the Acts of the Council to any such idea, as that Honorius's error (if error there were) had been taught by him as obligatory on the Catholic's interior assent. The strongest view which could possibly be taken as to the Council's condemnation of Honorius, would only be, that it declared him a heretic in the very same sense in which it so declared Sergius, Cyrus, and the rest.* But in regard to these, the Council most assuredly did not intend to pronounce that they had promulgated heresy in the capacity of *Universal Teachers*; because no one supposed them to *possess* any such capacity. Neither therefore did the Council intend to pronounce, that *Honorius* had promulgated heresy in his capacity of *Universal Teacher*.

If it can be worth while to say another word on so very plain a matter, we may remind our readers of the ready submission paid by the Bishops, to S. Agatho's claim of *ex cathedrâ* infallibility. This has been put by F. Bottalla with

* So Mr. Willis: "the word heretic is applied in the same sense to Honorius as to the others" (p. 13).

great clearness and force of language. Pope S. Agatho, he says, in addressing the Bishops of the Sixth Council,

“sets before them the formula of Catholic faith, which is the formula of the Apostolic Magisterium of the Roman See; and he informs them they must believe and confess it, and on the other hand condemn and reject every dogma contrary to it. Should they refuse to submit to this Rule of Faith, they would be in error, in schism, and reprobation. But he could not impose a formula of Faith to be believed and confessed, unless his Magisterium was universally acknowledged as infallible. Therefore he *repeatedly insists on that capital point of doctrine*. He declares that the Roman See *has never erred, and that it never shall err*. He confirms and explains his assertion, by referring to the promises of Christ, to the example of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and of the Œcumenical Synods themselves, which *had always received from Rome the paradigm of the doctrine they were to define*.—‘Pope Honorius before the tribunal, &c.,’ pp. 89, 90.

“And now let us see how the assembled Fathers received his two Letters. Did they lift up their voice in protest against the fundamental doctrine of Infallibility, which Agatho attributed to his See, and which he rested on the promises of Christ Himself? Was objection raised to the magisterial tone of the letters addressed to an Œcumenical Council? That large and influential assembly of Bishops not only found nothing to censure in the Letters of the Pope, but it received them as a whole and in all their parts as if they had been written by S. Peter, or rather by God Himself. The Fathers *testified to their admitting the infallible and divine authority of the Letters*, in the Eighth Session, as well as in the Synodical Letter addressed to Agatho; and *in the Prosphonic Letter sent to the Emperor they regarded them as a Rule of Faith*. No sooner did a suspicion arise that four bishops and two monks refused to adhere to them, than the Council ordered them to give an explanation of their faith in writing and on oath. They submitted, and solemnly affirmed that they accepted without reserve all the heads of doctrine contained in the Letters. Again Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, was, by sentence of the Council, deposed from his dignity and expelled from the Synod, because he refused to adhere to the Letters of Agatho.”—(pp. 90-92.)

A very obvious logical process will here suggest itself to every reader. No one certainly will maintain such a proposition as the following. No one will maintain, that the Bishops first took for granted the infallibility of *all* Popes in *all* their *ex cathedrâ* Decrees; and that they then proceeded to condemn of heresy one particular *ex cathedrâ* Decree (acknowledged by them to be such) of one particular Pope.

Here however we should make a distinct explanation. Even if the Bishops had pronounced Honorius guilty of teaching falsely *ex cathedrâ*, no Catholic would count such a judgment of itself to be infallible. No Catholic ever considered an Œcumenical Council to speak infallibly, except so far as its utterances were confirmed by the Apostolic See. And since the Vatican Council has published its pronouncements, no Catholic (we think) can fairly misunderstand the position held by Councils, in regard to the voice of Infallibility. "The Roman Pontiffs," says the Vatican Council, "as time and circumstances required, *either by convening Œcumenical Synods*, or by consulting the Church spread over the world, or by local Synods, or by *other helps* supplied by Divine Providence, have defined that those things should be held, which (by God's help) they knew to be in accordance with Holy Scripture and the Apostolical Traditions." Œcumenical Councils then are only one out of various classes of instruments, which this or that Pope employs, as a means for arriving at his infallible decision. So speaks Cardinal Newman. "A council of the Bishops of the world around" a Pope, he says, "is only one of the various modes in which he exercises his Infallibility. The seat of Infallibility is in him, and they are the adjuncts." (Norfolk Letter, p. 168, smaller edition.)

In the present instance accordingly, the critical question is not whether certain *Bishops* condemned Honorius of having taught falsely *ex cathedrâ*, but whether any *Pope* has ever so condemned him. We need not however embark at any length on this question. No one of any school has ever

maintained, that any Pope passed a severer judgment on Honorius, than was passed on him by the Fathers of the Sixth Council. But it is evident on the very surface, that even they did not condemn him as guilty of uttering heresy *ex cathedrâ*. Much less therefore did S. Leo II. or succeeding Pontiffs brand his memory with any such reproach. We shall in due course however maintain with great confidence much more than this. We shall maintain that they never ascribed to him the offence, of having been personally imbued with the Monothelistic heresy at all. And the whole of that future argument is of course here directly in point. If they did not consider him to have *held* that heresy, they could not possibly have intended to condemn him as teaching it *ex cathedrâ*. At this particular point then, and in this immediate connection, we will only cite one further fact. No Pope or Council has ever used language of greater severity against Honorius, than the Eighth Œcumenical Council; and at a later period of our argument we shall have to ponder attentively its judgment. Yet the Fathers of this Council subscribed a Profession of faith sent them by Pope Adrian II., which contains the following words:—"In the Apostolic See"—so the Bishops profess—"the Catholic religion has ever been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine preached." But to suppose that a Roman Pontiff has once taught heresy *ex cathedrâ*, is *ipso facto* to *repudiate* that Profession. For in other words it is to suppose, that the Apostolic See has once *corrupted* "the Catholic religion," instead of "preserving it immaculate;" and has directly "preached" the very *reverse* of "holy doctrine."

IV.

Most certainly then no voice, accounted by Catholics infallible, has ever pronounced that Honorius taught heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*. A second ground however is un-

doubtedly open to an anti-Catholic objector. He may argue that—whereas on the one hand Popes have condemned Honorius's Letters as heretical—on the other hand it is plain *from circumstances* that those Letters were issued *ex cathedrâ*.* Now in order to deal fairly with this precise question, we will admit for argument's sake, what otherwise we absolutely deny. We will admit for argument's sake, that Honorius's response to Sergius was imbued with Monothelism. But (as we pointed out at starting) no Catholic accounts any Papal utterances *ex cathedrâ*, except those in which the Pontiff purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. And this being understood, we must really submit that there are few facts in ecclesiastical history more obvious, than the "*non ex cathedrâ*" character of Honorius's Letters. We entirely admit, that he wrote them in his official capacity as Supreme Pontiff, with the direct purpose of supporting what he believed to be religious truth. Moreover it is most easily *imaginable*, that he might have thought the interests of religious truth would be best promoted by an *ex cathedrâ* definition. But (we say) it is obvious on the very surface, that he did not *in fact* so judge. He judged that his appropriate course as Vicar of Christ was—not to define anything *ex cathedrâ*—but (as F. Bottalla expresses it) to "quiet the controversy by an economy of silence." He judged that his appropriate course as Vicar of Christ was, to obtain from the Eastern Bishops, that they should abstain from *speaking at all* either of "one energy" or "two energies." Those who hold that he spoke *ex cathedrâ*, must hold that in one, or other, or both of his Letters, he intended to teach the whole Church

* This is Mr. Willis's position. "The Patriarch of old Rome," he says (pp. 5, 6), "is being formally consulted by the Patriarch of new Rome, . . . speaking on this occasion for two other Patriarchs of the East; the subject, a doctrine intimately connected with the very vitals of the Catholic Faith; the matter, one which closely concerned the interests of the whole Eastern Church. If ever a Pope could be conceived of as speaking *ex cathedrâ*, it would be Pope Honorius in replying to Sergius, &c."

some obligatory doctrine. In other words—according to their view—Honorius intended to impose an obligation upon all Catholics of believing, either (1) that in Christ there is but one energy and one will; or else (2) that the phrase “two energies” is an inappropriate expression of Catholic dogma. We on our side maintain confidently, that the facts of the case are utterly irreconcilable with the theory, that he had any such intention. There is no more vital portion of the whole controversy, than that with which we are here engaged; and we solicit therefore our readers’ careful attention to our argument. We submit (1), that the “non ex cathedrâ” character of Honorius’s Letters is conclusively established, by what may be called their extrinsic history. But we submit (2), that the ecclesiastical events of the period are sufficient by themselves peremptorily to refute any other supposition. A demonstration in Euclid (we say) is hardly more apodeictic, than is the proof adducible for this latter statement. Firstly however to consider the comparatively subordinate particular: viz. the extrinsic history of these Letters.

The Pope speaks *ex cathedrâ*, and therefore infallibly, whenever he may think it well to teach any doctrine whatever (connected with faith or morals) as obligatory on all Catholics. Moreover—we entirely admit or rather maintain—God has left him perfectly free to make this obligation *known*, by any method (intrinsic or extrinsic) which he may account desirable. Still the *expressing* some doctrine in some Letter to an individual Bishop, is in itself of course quite a different thing, from declaring that doctrine *obligatory on all Catholics*. In order therefore that the Pope may be understood as teaching *ex cathedrâ*, something more is required, than his merely *expressing* it in some Letter to an individual. Something is required, which shall sufficiently indicate an intention of obliging the whole Catholic world to interior assent.

1. One test on which theologians lay great stress, is that of *publication*. By the fact of *circulating a Dogmatic Letter*

throughout the Church, a Pontiff expresses that it is intended, not for those only or him only to whom it is addressed, but for all Catholics. In Honorius's day, it was the universal habit of Popes so to act, when they issued Dogmatic Letters *ex cathedrâ*. Orsi insists on this, quoting an earlier writer in his support. Such letters "were transmitted to the Primates or Patriarchs of provinces; unless indeed there was some special reason for sending them to others. Then the Primates, or these others, communicated copies of them to the Bishops, either separately or synodically; and often both subscribed the Letters themselves, and required their suffragans so to do" (l. i. c. 22, s. 5).^{*} Now it is most certain, that Honorius never thus circulated his Letter to Sergius; and stress is laid on this fact by Roncaglia and by Muzzarelli. It will be useful to append Muzzarelli's passage at length.

"Tantum abest quin sollemnis Epistola vocari possit, ut in Occidente, ubi confecta fuerat, per plures annos incognita extiterit. Omnia igitur indicia privatæ epistolæ in eâ apparent. Scripta est nomine et jussu Honorii per ejus familiarem amanuensem, sive notarium, adedò secretè, ut unicè ab hoc amanuensi Joannes, Honorii successor, rescire potuerit ejus intentionem, et Epistolæ interpretationem. In Occidente, ut diximus, latuit per magnum intervallum; et tunc solùm innotuit, quum Pyrrhus, qui Sergio successerat, ad proprium sensum attrahere festinavit, quæ Honorius scripserat: sicuti Summus Pontifex, Joannes quartus, testatur in apologiâ ad Constantinum pro Honorio Papâ. Neque idedò dici potest, quòd tunc originalis epistola Honorii fuerit in Occidente evulgata; sed unicè testimonium factum fuit manifestum, quod de ipsâ reddiderat Pyrrhus in suis litteris, huc illuc transmissis. Et quidem de eâ nulla invenitur commemoratio aut accusatio in synodis Romanis subsequentibus, in quibus damnati sunt Monothelitæ, et Sergius, et Pyrrhus, et Paulus Constantino politani. In Oriente verò documentum non extat, quòd Honorii epistola

^{*} So Mr. Willis mentions (p. 11) that "Martin I. circulated" his Dnothelistic "decisions through the Western Church, and sought to obtain for them universal adoption,"

ne quidem à Sergio ad ecclesias missa fuerit. In ipsâ Sextæ Synodi actione 12. Epistola Honorii non aliunde, quàm ex scrinio Patriarchali ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ deprompta fuit, autographa ipsa Latina cum Græcâ interpretatione. Ad unum ergo Sergium missa, ab eoque recondita fuerat in archivio ecclesiæ; et ex eâ probabiliter aliqua solùm verba excerpterat Pyrrhus, quibus dolosè auctoritatem Honorii in suæ hæresis præsidium advocaret. Certè in synodo Lateranensi sub Martino primo, in quâ Stephanus, Dorensis Episcopus, ex parte etiam Hierosolimitanæ Sedis, libellum obtulit adversùs errores Sergii et ejus successorum Pyrrhi et Pauli, nullam de Honorii Epistolâ notitiam manifestavit; quam tamen recensere necessarium fuisset pro hâc causâ. Idem silentium observatur in libello monachorum Græcorum, qui pro eodem negotio lectus fuit, et qui orthodoxorum Orientalium querelam de Honorii Epistolâ deferre ad synodum in hâc circumstantiâ debuissent. Quin etiam in Typo Constantis, cujus Paulus Monothelita auctor fuerat et in quo prohibebatur omnis contentio de unâ voluntate et unâ operatione aut duabus voluntatibus et operationibus, nullum testimonium profertur ex Epistolâ Honorii; quod tamen Paulus Constanti suggerere debuisset, ut Typum apud Occidentales defenderet, et contra Martini condemnationem sibi ipsi consuleret.”

Orsi again,—having pointed out (as we just now mentioned) that in those days, according to universal habit, a Pope’s ex cathedrâ Letter was circulated everywhere, was formally accepted, and was often subscribed by the Episcopate,—proceeds to dwell on the fact, that nothing of the kind took place with either of Honorius’s Letters to Sergius. Sergius and his successors, he says, instead of proposing *Honorius’s Letter* for subscription, proposed Heraclius’s *Ecthesis* or Constans’s *Type*.

2. There is a second argument, much used by controversialists, which we cannot better express than in Muzzarelli’s words, slightly abridged. It was the constant habit of Pontiffs, he says, never to speak ex cathedrâ, without first assembling a *Synod* either of Bishops or of Roman Presbyters; more commonly the former. So Innocent and

Zosimus acted in the case of Pelagius and Celestius; Celestine against Nestorius; Leo against Eutyches; &c. &c. In like manner, as to this very Monothelite controversy: John IV., Theodore, Martin, and Agatho, all assembled Synods, before putting forth their *ex cathedrâ* Definitions. But Honorius's Letter to Sergius was not preceded by any such consultation; and this fact alone sufficiently shows, that he never intended it to be *ex cathedrâ*.

Orsi illustrates this same argument from the "*Liber Diurnus*." In the professions of faith which that book contains, the Pontiffs promise that they will accept and preach whatever their predecessors have *synodically* accepted and preached; and that they anathematize whatever their predecessors have *synodically* anathematized. They use the word "*synodically*," as synonymous with what would now be called "*ex cathedrâ*."

Orsi and Muzzarelli do not of course mean, that a Pope has no power to pronounce *ex cathedrâ* without consulting a Synod. Their argument is this. At that time it was the universal habit of Popes to consult some Synod, before they spoke as Universal Teachers; and a Pope's omission therefore of such consultation in some given case, is a strong argument that in that case he did *not* intend to speak as Universal Teacher. Now it is certain from history, that Honorius consulted no Synod before writing to Sergius; therefore, &c.

These two considerations are very clearly urged by F. Bottalla.

"According to the discipline and practice of the Church in ancient times, which was preserved for many centuries, there are some solemnities which were ordinarily observed, when dogmatic constitutions were despatched by Roman Pontiffs. They were previously read and examined in the Synod of the Bishops of Italy, with whom the Prelates of neighbouring provinces were sometimes associated; or in the assembly of the clergy of the Roman Church.* Again,

* "The place of these meetings," adds F. Bottalla, "was at a later period

they were sent to the Patriarchs, or even to the Primates and Metropolitans, that they might be everywhere known and obeyed. Finally, the signatures of all the Bishops were often required to those Papal Constitutions, to show their submission and adhesion to them. We do not now mean to spend time in demonstrating these points of ancient ecclesiastical discipline; they will be found proved beyond all question in the learned works of Coustant, Thomassin, and Cardinal Orsi. . . . It must be distinctly understood that we do not maintain the absolute necessity of the above-mentioned characters, as if no Papal utterance of that age could be *ex cathedrâ* if any one of these marks were wanting. But we maintain affirmatively, that Papal utterances bearing all these characters were to be regarded as certainly issued *ex cathedrâ*; and negatively, that no Papal decree could be considered at that time as *ex cathedrâ*, if wanting in all and each of those characters.—(pp. 18, 19.)

It is certain then from the extrinsic history of Honorius's Letters, that they were not issued *ex cathedrâ*. But, as we have said, it is the contemporary ecclesiastical history of the period, which shows the utter absurdity of supposing that they *were*. If they were issued *ex cathedrâ*, they were intended to impose on all Christians the obligation of believing some given doctrine. We ask, *what* doctrine? Monothelism? If *this* be the answer of our opponents, we would beg them to consider for one moment the admitted facts of the case. No one—be he Catholic, Protestant, or infidel—has ever doubted, that Duothelism was at that time the doctrine of the whole West. According to the hypothesis however which we are now encountering, our opponents must maintain two propositions. They must maintain (1), that Honorius believed Monothelism to be revealed truth, and Duothelism to be deadly heresy. And they must maintain (2), that he intended to impose on all Catholics the *obligation* of so believing. According to this view of the case, all the Western Sees were regarded by him as involved in deadly supplied by the Consistories of Cardinals, where the Popes read their utterances, destined to be despatched to the Universal Church."

heresy; and yet he did not exhibit to them the slightest displeasure at so terrible a fact. Nay, more than this must be said. It must be said that he imposed on them an obligation of renouncing their heresy, and yet did not take one single step to acquaint them with such obligation. Even this is not all. To speak *ex cathedrâ*, is to proclaim a certain doctrine as obligatory on all Catholics. Our opponents then must allege *generally*, that he proclaimed such an obligation; and they must at the same time admit *in particular*, that he did *not* proclaim it, even to those "heretics" who were in his immediate proximity and closest daily intimacy.

In fact the only mistaken Definition, which can be ascribed to Honorius without outrageous absurdity, concerns, not the dogma, but its expression. It may be contended that Honorius taught *ex cathedrâ* the doctrine, that either of those two phrases—"one energy," "two energies,"—is an inappropriate expression of the revealed verity. But we need not go beyond the very text of the Letters, to see the complete untenableness of this view. The last sentence of the second Letter is as simply fatal to any such theory, as though Honorius had presaged the future controversy, and had resolved to make all misconception impossible. S. Sophronius's Envoys promised that their Patriarch would abstain from the phrase "two energies," if Cyrus would only abstain from the phrase "one energy": and with this promise Honorius declared himself abundantly satisfied. According to the theory which we are opposing, Honorius had commanded Sophronius, Cyrus, and all other Catholics, to hold with irreformable interior assent, that the two phrases are both of them inappropriate. Yet what are the facts? So far from *commanding* them to hold any such *doctrine*, he did not even *ask* them to form any such *opinion*. All he desired was external conformity; and he obtained his full purpose, as soon as that external conformity was secured. The whole proceeding was disciplinary, not doctrinal, from beginning to end.

As a last resource it may be alleged, that Honorius imposed

an obligation of holding, as a dogmatic fact, that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" involved no denial of revealed truth. But it is certain, that S. Sophronius's Envoys made the whole submission which Honorius desired at their hand. It is certain therefore, *either* that the Saint came to hold that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" involved no denial of revealed truth; *or else* that the Pope never imposed on him any *obligation* of holding this. But the former branch of the alternative is simply out of the question. Honorius was undeniably doing everything he could, towards promoting union between Sophronius and Sergius. If therefore he could possibly have told the latter that the former withdrew his accusation of heresy, he would beyond all question have said as much most loudly and emphatically. Since therefore S. Sophronius did *not* withdraw his accusation of heresy—and since nevertheless he made all the concession which Honorius demanded of him—it follows that Honorius never imposed on him any *obligation* of withdrawing the charge of heresy. But if Honorius imposed no such obligation on *Sophronius*, certainly he imposed no such obligation on *the whole Church*. It is demonstratively certain therefore, that Honorius never imposed on the whole Church any obligation of holding, that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" involved no denial of revealed truth. In other words, it is demonstratively certain that, Honorius never taught this *ex cathedrâ*, as a dogmatical fact.

To sum up then. An *ex cathedrâ* Act is an Act, in which some Pope purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. And this definition being supposed, it is most certain that Honorius did not teach any false doctrine *ex cathedrâ*. This is most certain; because no one can so much as *name* any one false doctrine, in regard to which he will even *allege* that Honorius imposed on the whole Church an obligation of believing it.*

* Mr. Willis three times (pp. 14, 21, 33) cites Petavius as admitting, that Honorius "decreed" Monothelism. Not only Petavius does not

V.

We have now fully established (we trust) two conclusions. Firstly we have shown that no voice, regarded by Catholics as infallible, ever pronounced Honorius to have spoken erroneously *ex cathedrâ*. And secondly we have made clear, how inconsistent are the facts of the case with any supposition, that he issued his Letters *ex cathedrâ* at all. Now these (as we have already pointed out) are the only two conclusions on which a Catholic need be anxious. Let it be granted for argument's sake, that Honorius was personally heretical; nay (if you will) that he was infallibly pronounced to be such: there is no Catholic dogma which would suffer by the admission. On the other hand it is plain of course that, if Honorius never expressed heresy at all, he never expressed it *ex cathedrâ*. We shall give additional strength therefore to the Catholic position, if we are able to establish this *further* thesis. And we are convinced that it admits of being established with entire certainty. To this further task then we now proceed. We shall maintain (1) that no voice, regarded by Catholics as infallible, ever condemned Honorius as guilty of heresy. And we shall maintain (2) that his Letters, when they are fairly and candidly examined, will be found entirely void of heretical taint. We begin with the former of those two theses.

At starting we admit, that the Bishops of the Sixth Council did condemn Honorius of heresy. "To Honorius the heretic anathema." Several excellent Catholics think this proposition doubtful; but we cannot ourselves see room for fair doubt of its truth. The critical question however is, whether any *Pope* ever confirmed their condemnation. We

admit, that Honorius *decreed* Monothelism; he confidently denies, that the Pontiff *held* that doctrine. In the passage quoted by Mr. Willis, he does not say that Honorius decreed Monothelism, but that the Monothelists *alleged* him to have decreed it: which is a very different thing.

emphatically deny that any Pope ever did so. And we will consider successively the various Popes, in regard to whom such an allegation has been, or can be, put forward.

Firstly then, did S. Agatho confirm the episcopal judgment by anticipation? For *this* statement has before now been made, as deducible from the Bishops' address to S. Agatho. "We have slain," they say, the heretics with anathema, "according to the sentence previously issued against them by your sacred Letter." And they proceed to name Honorius, among those whom they have thus anathematized. Now if S. Agatho's Letter were not extant, a certain probability—though certainly not a strong one—might accrue from these words to the conclusion based on them. Certainly not a strong one; for nothing is more probable, than that S. Agatho might *generally* have enjoined the anathematization of Monothelite heretics, without enumerating any particular names. At all events his Letters *are* extant; both that addressed to the Emperor, and that addressed to the Council: and in neither is Honorius's name to be found.

But this is by no means all. Not only S. Agatho did *not* refer to Honorius as to a *heretic*; he *did* expressly refer to that Letter of his which the Council afterwards condemned, as to the Letter of a perfectly orthodox man. We allude to the following often-quoted passage. "My predecessors," says S. Agatho to the Emperor, "*thoroughly instructed* (*κατηρτισμένοι*) *as they were in the Lord's doctrine*, from the time when the *Constantinopolitan Patriarchs* endeavoured to introduce this heretical novelty into Christ's spotless Church, have never neglected to exhort and entreatingly press them, that they would desist from this heretical pravity, *were it only by keeping silence.*" Now no other Pope, except Honorius, was contented with exhorting the heretical Patriarchs to *silence*; nor has any one therefore ever doubted, that the concluding words above quoted refer to that Pontiff. We do not of course suppose that such a passage is ex cathedrâ. But it expresses S. Agatho's own personal

opinion, that Honorius was a Predecessor, "thoroughly instructed in the Lord's doctrine," and not insensible to the deadly evil of Monothelism. It is the absurdest of suppositions therefore, that the very Legates who bore the Letter had received instructions to condemn, as guilty of heresy, the Pontiff thus honourably mentioned.

At the same time there is no difficulty whatever in supposing (should there be historical evidence for such a conclusion) that S. Agatho instructed his Legates to permit the Council to examine for itself into the doctrine of Honorius's Letter.* It certainly seems improbable that they would have acquiesced in this, had they not been previously directed to that effect. And Adrian II. long afterwards pointed out, "that no bishop would have had the right of expressing concerning" Honorius "any judgment whatever, unless the authority of the Primatial See had gone before." These words would seem on the surface to show, that S. Agatho had permitted the Council to express its judgment on Honorius's orthodoxy. However convinced he indubitably was of that orthodoxy, there was nothing at all inconsistent with Catholic principle in his permitting this examination; while there were various reasons of expediency, which might powerfully have prompted his doing so. He well knew, that at last no declaration which the Council might issue would possess irreformable authority, until it had been confirmed by himself, or by some one of his Successors.

However it may be urged, as an argument against Honorius's orthodoxy, that when the examination took place, its result was most unfavourable to his memory. It may be urged that the whole body of Eastern Bishops—and the three Papal Legates also—condemned his Letters in the severest terms. Well, at all events this is a total change of ground: it is to abandon the allegation of an *infallible* condemnation. For ourselves however, we cannot attach

* We use the singular, as we are not aware of any evidence that the second Letter had been heard of at Rome.

any importance to the judgment on such a question of the Eastern contemporary Bishops; though it would carry us too far if we gave reasons for our opinion. In regard to the Papal Legates, it must be remembered that S. Agatho himself, in his Letter to the Emperor, spoke disparagingly of their theological acquirements;* and that they would naturally be carried away by the influences which surrounded them. It is simply impossible that, in condemning Honorius as a heretic, they can have been exponents of contemporary Roman opinion; for we have seen how directly contradictory is the language of S. Agatho himself.

We have shown then, that the 13th and 16th Sessions, and also the Acclamation, "to Honorius the heretic anathema," at all events have not that claim to infallibility, which would have resulted from S. Agatho's approval. We now proceed to point out secondly, that neither were they included in S. Leo II.'s confirmation of the Council. We shall immediately be quoting his words of confirmation; and it will be seen that he entirely restricts it to the Council's *Definition*. In writing to the bishops of Spain, he tells them that he sends a Latin translation of the *Definition*—of the *Prosphonic Letter*—of the *Emperor's Edict*; and that he intends shortly to send the *Acts*. Meanwhile he enjoins that they shall at once subscribe their names—not to the *Prosphonic Letter* or the *Emperor's Edict*, though these had been sent—but to the *Definition*.

"We exhort you.....that by all the reverend Bishops submission should be annexed to the *Definition* of the venerable Council; and that each prelate of Christ's Churches may hasten to enrol his name in a book of life, and thus, *through the confession of his subscription*, unite, as though present in spirit, with ourselves and the whole Council in union of the One Evangelical and Apostolical Faith."

* "We send them," he says, "for the sake of that compliance which we owe you, not from any confidence in them on the ground of their abundant knowledge."

The same declaration is to be found in his Letter to the King of Spain, and again to Simplicius. Except indeed (which is not quite unimportant) that in the two latter Letters he says nothing about any intention of forwarding the *Acts* of the Council.

That declaration then of the Council, which S. Leo confirmed, was precisely its *Definition*. It is demonstratively shown by the preceding extracts, that this "Definition" is entirely exclusive of the Acts, of the Proshonetic Letter, and of the Emperor's Edict; and, on turning to the history of the Council, there can be no possible doubt as to what is intended by the phrase. It may be found in the history of the eighteenth Session, and is called in so many words, "the Definition." "Constantine, most pious Emperor said, 'Let the before-mentioned Definition (*ῥος*, definitio) be read'; and the reader . . . read the Definition as follows." It is subscribed by all the Eastern bishops, with the phrase, "*ὀρίσας ὑπέγραψα*," "definiens subscripsi." This, and this only, is that doctrinal Declaration of the Sixth Council, which received S. Leo's confirmation. And if we would know the Council's infallible Decree concerning Honorius, it is to this only that we must look. These are its words concerning him :—

"The devil, having found suitable organs for his design, Theodore, Sergius, &c., and Honorius, who was Pope of the old Rome, and Cyrus, &c., &c., did not cease to raise up by their means, against the fulness of the Church, the scandals of error of one will and one energy in the two natures of One of the Holy Trinity, Christ our True God; disseminating among our orthodox people, by their novel language, a heresy harmonizing with that of Apollinaris, &c., &c."

The Definition of faith, which contains these words, was thus solemnly confirmed by S. Leo II.

"The holy, universal, and great Sixth Council hath followed in all things Apostolic doctrine; and because it hath perfectly declared that Definition (*ῥος*) of the right Faith which the Apostolic Throne of Blessed Peter

hath humbly received, therefore we—and through our ministry this worshipful and Apostolic Throne—symbolize in heart and spirit with those things which *have been defined* (ὁρισθεῖσι) thereby, and *confirm them* by the authority of Blessed Peter, as [fixed] on a firm Rock, which is Christ.”

S. Leo however at once proceeds to remove all doubt, as to the sense in which he confirms the anathema pronounced on Honorius. Having anathematized by name various ancient heretics, he passes on to those just condemned by the Council :—

“In like manner we anathematize the inventors of the new error : Theodore, bishop of Pharan ; Cyrus of Alexandria ; Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, traitors against, rather than rulers of, the Constantinopolitan Church : nay, and Honorius also ; who did not labour to preserve in purity this Apostolic Church by the teaching of Apostolic Tradition, but suffered the spotless to be polluted by the profane betrayal :* and likewise all who have shared in their error, &c., &c.”

Every one surely must here see, that the Holy Pontiff draws an emphatic distinction between the other anathematized persons and Honorius ; and consequently, that he does not confirm the Definition of the Council, in any sense inconsistent with this broad distinction. The Council had placed Honorius’s name in the middle of the heretical list ; S. Leo II. removed it into a separate place of its own. Then he anathematized him for an offence generically different from that offence of which the rest were guilty. They were active, Honorius was passive ; they were *inventors* of the new error, while he *permitted* the spotless to be defiled by it. But if Honorius had been himself a Monothelite heretic, he would have been no less an “inventor of the new error” than were Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Paul, or Peter ;† for it was none of these

* Mr. Willis (p. 16) quotes this differently. “By a foul betrayal attempted to subvert its spotless faith.” This is taken from the Latin translation. But the Greek runs as we have put it in the text : “τῇ βεβήλῳ προδοσίᾳ μανθῆναι τὴν ἄσπιλον παρεχώρησε.”

† “Monothelitarum parens fuit Sergius.”—Nat. Alexander.

who *originally started* the heretical idea. S. Leo then abstained pointedly from all language which could be understood to imply, that Honorius had himself fallen into heresy. He did not condemn Honorius as a *heretic*. But he proclaimed infallibly the dogmatical fact, that Honorius had grievously injured the Church, by his failure in that energetic *resistance* to heresy, which was among the highest duties incumbent on a Roman Pontiff.

Nothing, in fact, can be more intelligible and more consistent, than S. Leo's language on this head throughout. He says the very same thing to the Spanish Bishops and the Spanish King, that he says to the Greek Emperor :—

“Those who fought against the purity of Apostolic Doctrine and have died, have been punished by an eternal condemnation : that is, Theodore, Cyrus, &c. &c. ; together with Honorius, who did not extinguish at its outset the flame of heretical dogma, as became his Apostolic authority, but *by neglecting* fostered it.

“All the *authors* of heretical assertion were cast out from the Church's unity ; Theodore, Cyrus, &c. : and *with them*, Honorius of Rome, who *consented* that that undefiled rule of Apostolic tradition should be defiled, which he received from his predecessors.”

We may illustrate the bearing of S. Leo II.'s sentence on Honorius, by an obvious parallel. A mutiny arises in some regiment, and the Colonel is accused before a Court-Martial of being concerned in it. The Court pronounces, that Captains A and B, Lieutenants C, D, and E, &c. &c., were concerned in the mutiny ; nay, and that the Colonel himself did not, as was his duty, detect it at its beginning and promptly put it down ; but on the contrary, by his neglect fostered its growth, and permitted the loyalty of the regiment to be stained. No one surely of common sense would understand this verdict otherwise, than as condemning the Colonel indeed of very culpable neglect, but acquitting him of all sympathy with the mutiny. Had Honorius been himself disposed to Monothelism, his *neglect*—instead

of being a calamity—would have been the very best thing for the Church which under circumstances could happen.

Let any candid reader in fact first observe the very definite and stringent words of the Bishops ; and then let him weigh S. Leo's most carefully weighed expressions. We do not think he will be able to doubt, that the Pontiff is wishing indeed to express as much agreement with the Bishops as he possibly can ; but that, in this particular case of Honorius, he is accepting their anathema in a fundamentally different sense from that in which they uttered it. It cannot be by accident, that in each successive instance he separates Honorius's name from the others with which the Bishops had intermixed it, and gives it a separate position of its own. It cannot be by accident, that the distinction is throughout so consistently maintained, between those who promoted the heresy by their evil activity, and him who promoted it by his most culpable neglect.

In fact our opponents show (we think) a certain consciousness, that S. Leo's expressions fall greatly short of what is required by their argument. For they try to make out, that S. Leo's sanction extended to certain other pronouncements of the Council, and not to the Definition alone. This however is a very forlorn hope indeed. We may cite F. Bottalla's excellent statement on this head.

“The Fathers of the Sixth Synod, at the end of the eighteenth Session, asked the Emperor to send to all the Patriarchal Sees an authentic copy of the Definition of faith, signed by the Council. Pope Leo II. confirmed nothing but the Definition of faith ; although he received all the acts of the Synod, together with the Imperial Edict. We have several letters of this Pope, in which he either authoritatively confirms the Sixth Council, or communicates to the Bishops his adhesion to it. In all and each of them he pointedly limits his confirmation and approval to the Dogmatic Definition. In his official Letter to the Emperor, he declares only that he confirms the Definition of the right faith.

In his Letter to the Bishops of Spain he tells them, that he forwards to them the Definition of faith sanctioned in the Sixth Synod, the Prosphonic Address to the Emperor, and his Edict; he promises that he will send the whole of the conciliar Acts; but he requires their signatures to no more than the Definition of faith. He says the same in his Letter to Simplicius, and in that addressed to King Ervigius. So that no doubt whatever can remain, with regard to his intention being really what he expresses. Again, in what manner did he sanction the Definition of faith, and in what sense did he anathematize Honorius? ‘Since the holy, universal, and great Sixth Synod,’ he says, . . . ‘has followed in everything the apostolic doctrine of the most eminent fathers, and since it preached the same *Definition of the right faith* which the Apostolic See of the holy Apostle Peter received with veneration, therefore we, and through our exercise of our office this venerable Apostolic See, gives full consent to *the things contained in the Definition of faith*; and confirms them with the authority of the blessed Peter, that, being placed on the solid rock of Christ himself, *it may be supplied by the Lord with strength.*’”

Our opponents indeed sometimes urge, as an argument against our view, that S. Leo II. widely circulated the Emperor’s Edict, the Acts, and the Prosphonic Letter, without hinting the least disagreement from the sense of the Council. This circumstance shows no doubt that, in his judgment, the general drift and contents of Edict, Acts, and Prosphonic Letter were admirable; and that they contained nothing, from which it was desirable that he should explicitly state any disagreement. But no one will allege, that this is tantamount to imposing on all Catholics an obligation of receiving the whole with irreformable interior assent. On the contrary, as to the Definition, S. Leo placed it “on the solid rock of Christ Himself”; and all the Bishops had been required to subscribe it, in token of unreserved interior acceptance. The Edict, Acts, and Prosphonic Letter

were most edifying ecclesiastical documents, heartily recommended to the careful and respectful study of the faithful. But it was the Definition which was to be received, as the very voice of Peter living in his successors.

Surely indeed common sense speaks on the subject, with a plainness from which there is no appeal. The infallibility of a Council means the infallibility of what it *defines*; and what it defines is simply, by the very force of terms, its *Definition*.*

It has sometimes been urged indeed, that S. Leo, by not expressing any disapproval of the Acts when he received them, implied assent to every single portion of their contents. We cannot for a moment acquiesce in such reasoning. All Catholic readers of Church History must have often observed the inexpressibly difficult task, which in each successive century devolves on the Holy Father. He must not permit anything, which shall compromise the Truth. Yet, on the other hand, he must so defend the Truth, that there may be the smallest possible dissension among Catholics; and that unstable minds may be visited by the smallest possible temptation towards rebellion and schism. It was in this critical and most anxious navigation between Scylla and Charybdis, that Honorius himself made the one deplorable mistake of his otherwise illustrious Pontificate. And the ties between East and West were even looser in the time of S. Leo II., than they had been in those of his Predecessor. One only question have men any right to ask. Did S. Leo speak with sufficient explicitness in his official Letter, to make clear in what sense he consented to Honorius's anathematization? This he certainly did. It would have been wrong to say less; but under circumstances,

* It has been suggested to us, that our remarks may possibly be understood as denying the infallibility of the Tridentine capitula. But hardly any fact in history is more certain, than that these were promulgated as no less integral a portion of the Tridentine *Definitions*, than were the canons themselves. Dr. Murray has exhibited in full, following earlier theologians, the singularly cogent arguments which establish this conclusion.

it would probably have also been wrong to say one iota more.

There is another and independent argument, which importantly corroborates our conclusion. If S. Leo had intended to condemn Honorius as a heretic, it is most difficult to understand how he can have departed so widely from S. Agatho's judgment. But nothing can be more intelligible, than his conduct on the other hypothesis. The Legates would have given him a far stronger notion than any previous Pontiff had entertained, on the frightful evil which Honorius's Letters had wrought in the East. Such a report could not affect the Holy Pontiff's opinion on his Predecessor's *orthodoxy*; but it would profoundly affect his judgment, as to the injury which that Predecessor had inflicted on the Church's Faith.

We conclude then with great confidence, that neither S. Agatho nor S. Leo II. confirmed any condemnation of Honorius on the ground of heresy. But if S. Leo did not so condemn him, no one whosoever (we suppose) will allege that any subsequent Pope did so. Nor indeed is there any *primâ facie* appearance of such a phenomenon, except in one case. This particular case however does seem on the surface of much force, and we must therefore proceed to quote it. The Eighth Council—confirmed by Pope Adrian II.—thus speaks in its Definition.

“We receive the holy universal Sixth Synod, which wisely asserted that in the two natures of one Christ there exist by consequence two energies and wills. And we anathematize Theodore who was Bishop of Pharan, and Sergius, and Pyrrhus, and Paul, and Peter, impious prelates of the Church of Constantinople; and with them Honorius of Rome together with Cyrus of Alexandria: moreover also Macarius of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen: who, following the dogmata of Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Severus, impious heresiarchs, preached that the flesh of God, animated by a rational and intellectual soul, is without energy and without will,” &c. &c.

Of course—as we need hardly remind our readers—there is not a syllable in this sentence, which implies ever so distantly that Honorius taught heresy *ex cathedrâ*. In fact, as we have already seen (p. 16), the Council emphatically rejects the supposition, that any Pope *ever* taught heresy *ex cathedrâ*. Still, if the sentence stood alone and had to be interpreted by its more obvious meaning, it would afford (we readily admit) much ground for the opinion, that Honorius was condemned by Adrian II. for falling into heresy. But surely such an interpretation is *à priori* improbable, in a degree one can hardly exaggerate. It is quite incredible, we say, that after an interval of two centuries, and with no practical bearing whatever, and without the very slightest further examination of the inculcated writings, a Pope should (as it were) go out of his way, to visit Honorius with a censure, differing in kind from that pronounced by the earlier Pontiff. The most ordinary rules of criticism would lead to the conclusion, that if these words can legitimately be understood in Leo II.'s sense, such sense must be the one intended.

Now, as it happens, we can most easily show that such a sense is *perfectly* legitimate. S. Leo II., as has been seen, in writing to the Spanish King and Bishops, clearly explained the offence for which he had anathematized Honorius. He anathematized Honorius, for having “fostered the flame of heretical dogma, by *neglecting* to extinguish it”; for having “*consented* that the undefiled rule of tradition should be defiled.” His words, as we have pointed out, are absolutely incompatible with the supposition, that he considered Honorius a Monothelite. Yet, after this last expression, he immediately proceeds to say in his Letter to King Ervigius, that “all these”—i.e. including Honorius—“*preaching one will and one energy*, shamelessly laboured to defend heretical doctrine.” His meaning in these words is made absolutely certain, by what immediately preceded. All these anathematized persons combined—each in his own way—to disseminate among Chris-

tians the Monothelite heresy. Others did their work, by actually advocating that heresy; Honorius, by his most culpable remissness in regard to opposing it, and by his refusal to authorize the orthodox terminology. S. Leo II. then, the very Pontiff who condemned Honorius, declared indeed that Honorius had been one of those who "preached" Monothelism; and yet, in the very same sentence, explained that Honorius had done this merely by means of his culpable neglect. No fact can be more certain, than that this was S. Leo's meaning; and when therefore the later Council repeated S. Leo's very words, it is no unreasonable interpretation to understand them as S. Leo meant them. We have no doubt whatever that such was Adrian II.'s sense, in confirming the Definition of the Eighth Council. Either he explicitly intended that sense; or (which seems more probable) he merely intended to confirm whatever it was that S. Leo II. had pronounced, concerning the doctrinal offenders of his period. What S. Leo's meaning was, has been already seen. Theodore, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Honorius, Cyrus, and the rest combined in disseminating the Monothelite heresy. The others did so by actively teaching it; Honorius by not resisting, but rather in effect most vigorously forwarding, their combined movement.

VI.

Let us sum up our argument as far as we have gone. In regard to the essential question at issue, we trust we have established two conclusions. First it is certain that no voice, accounted by Catholics infallible, ever condemned Honorius for having taught erroneously *ex cathedrâ*. Secondly it is certain, from the circumstances of the case, that his Letters were not issued *ex cathedrâ* at all. Having thus disposed of the essential question --we proceeded to the subordinate but by no means

unimportant inquiry, whether Honorius's Letters contain any erroneous doctrine whatever. And we have just given our reasons for confidently maintaining under this head, that they were never condemned as heretical, by any pronouncement which Catholics account infallible. We now come to the Letters themselves. The whole of one is extant, and part of another. We shall proceed to argue, that no trace is discernible in them of the slightest Monothelistic drift. But we must of course preface such argument by some little account of the Monothelistic heresy itself.

Among all the ramifications of Eutychianism, Monothelism seems on its surface the least unintelligible. The fundamental notion of Eutyches was, that Christ's two natures are blended and mixed up together by their union in God the Son. But when the question was asked him, what is the "*tertium quid*" which results from this intermixture, he was baffled. Now Monothelism gives an intelligible account of itself; and it has moreover the advantage of retaining the Catholic phraseology, as regards Christ's existence "*in two natures.*" We hope we shall not be thought irreverent if, for the sake of illustrating this Monothelite doctrine, we avail ourselves of a well-known Eastern story. Its hero shall be its narrator:—

"I was endowed by this beneficent genius with a singular power of deserting my own body when I pleased, and shooting my soul into the body of any dead animal I might meet. My first experience of this power was with the body of a magnificent stag, which had just died from breathless exhaustion in running. Immediately its body—now my body—rose into life, and I gazed with complacency on the beautiful form reflected in a neighbouring brook. Soon however the hunter's horn sounded at a distance. My cervine nature at once experienced a keen emotion of deadly fear, while my human nature at the same moment experienced an emotion of wonder at that fear. Speedily however my reason told me that danger was near at hand; and my feet, set in motion by command of my will, carried

me off at a speed to me astonishing, till they placed me in a safe spot."

Here appears on the surface a true case of one person in two natures. The narrator says, "*I experienced at once a cervine emotion of fear, and a human emotion of wonder at that fear.*" We cannot be surprised, in the parallel case, that Monothelites sincerely believed themselves to hold the dogma of "two natures." But a little consideration of the fable will show, that (without speaking of the human nature) the cervine nature at all events was not possessed in its integrity, but on the contrary was destitute of its principal element. There was no cervine *principle of operation*. The immediate cause, which set in motion the narrator's cervine legs, was his *human will*. The fable therefore affords a true analogy to the Monothelite tenet. According to that tenet, there is in Christ no human principle of action, no human will; but all things, done by the Sacred Humanity, are caused immediately by command of the divine will.

Now it would carry us much too far, if we attempted to give any sufficient account of the frightful results which issue logically from Monothelism. But it is important, even for our present purpose, to touch the matter superficially; and we will briefly indicate therefore two of these results.

Firstly there is no more vital dogma of the Faith, we need not say, than that the acts and words of Jesus Christ are the acts and words of God the Son; and not in any proper sense the acts and words of God the Father, or God the Holy Ghost. This vital dogma is utterly overthrown by Monothelism. Let us explain this statement. And let us begin with contemplating His *words*.

Now we ask this preliminary question:—To what person are those words truly ascribed, which are uttered by human organs? Of course to that person who has power over those organs, and who commands them to articulate those words. Read F. Surin's most interesting narrative about the Ursulines of Loudun. Some evil spirit possesses a certain nun,

and compels her mouth to utter frightful blasphemies. *Whose* words are these blasphemies? The nun's? No one would dream of saying so; they are the words of the evil spirit.

Consider then our Blessed Lord pronouncing, e.g., the Sermon on the Mount. Whose are those blessed words? They are the words of Him who commands our Lord's vocal organs to articulate them. But according to the Monothelites, this command is issued by no will except the divine; and every act of the divine will is common of course to the Three Divine Persons. According to Monothelism then, it is the Father no less truly and primarily than the Son, Who says, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit"; "Not My will, but Thine be done"; "The Father is greater than I"; &c., &c. If Christian dogma really resulted in such an issue as this, it would be self-contradictory and self-condemned. And what we have said on Christ's *words*, applies with equal force to His *acts*.

Then, secondly, Jesus Christ came on earth, as for other reasons, so also very prominently for this; that by practising human virtue, He "might leave us an example for us to follow His steps." We shall see subsequently the stress laid by Honorius on this doctrine. But human virtue consists exclusively in due regulation of the human will; above all, in its absolute and unreserved submission to the divine will. The Monothelites then in effect denied, that He gave us any example of human virtue whatever.*

Our direct purpose, in mentioning these two results of the heresy, is to make clear the precise and most unmistakable distinction between Monothelism and orthodoxy. But we have been far from unwilling incidentally to show, that this distinction is no minute and subtle splitting of hairs—as misbelievers and indifferentists love to declare—but on the contrary among the deepest and widest distinctions which

* Mr. Willis further adds with perfect truth, that Monothelism would also overthrow the revealed dogma of *the Atonement*.

can possibly be imagined; that the Monothelite heresy subverts Christianity from its very foundation.

We may thus sum up what we have now set forth. Catholics and Monothelites agree, that Christ possesses, not only human sensations of the body, but human emotions of the soul. They differ, in that Monothelites will not ascribe to him any human *will*, any human *principle of operation*; whereas Catholics say that His human nature is in itself operative, its operative principle being His human will.

The more frequently and more carefully we read Honorius's Letters, the more strange to us it seems that persons have been found, who suspect them of any the remotest tendency to Monothelism. Our own humble judgment is, that they demonstrate him to have held the orthodox dogma as clearly and explicitly, as it was held by S. Sophronius, S. Maximus, S. Martin I., S. Agatho, or S. Leo II. We cannot of course say that he *expressed* that dogma so clearly as did those Saints; simply because he knew nothing about Monothelism, and did not therefore express orthodoxy with a direct view to the contradiction of that heresy. But even as regards *expression* of dogma, we must maintain that his Letters are fully as complete and distinct as the renowned Exposition of S. Leo I.; and indeed, as will presently appear, somewhat more so.

The Monothelite issue assumed different forms, as the controversy advanced through successive stages. At first the question asked was, "Are there in Christ two energies or is there only one?": but latterly the question rather was, "Are there in Him two *wills*, or is there only one?" It is quite immaterial however, which of these questions you ask: for in regard to both, Honorius's answer on the orthodox side is as clear as noonday light. We begin with the first. Did Honorius hold, that there is in Christ a human principle of operation? In other words, did he hold that Christ's human nature—His human soul—is *operative*? Or on the contrary, did he hold (with the Monothelites) that it is purely passive? We should be glad to know how the most

orthodox Catholic who ever lived could give a more simply unmistakable answer to this question, than does Honorius in his second Letter. "We ought to confess," he says, "two natures in Christ *energizing and principles of action*:" "ἐνεργούσας καὶ πρακτικὰς" "operantes atque operatrices." Again. "Let us preach," he says, "the two natures *each operating its own proper acts*:" "τὰς δύο φύσεις ἐνεργούσας τὰ ἴδια": "duas naturas propria operantes."

So much on the human *energy*. But put the issue in its other shape. Did he hold that in Christ there is a human *will*? Turn to his first Letter. "We profess," he says, "one will of our Lord Jesus Christ: because plainly our *nature* was assumed by the Godhead, not the *sin* in it; that is, our nature as it was created before sin existed, not that which was corrupted after the transgression." The question to be here asked is most simple, and admits but of one possible reply. Is Honorius speaking in these words of Christ's divine or human will? One writer has amazingly said, that "the context of this passage" proves its reference to the *divine* will. Does he think then, or did Honorius think, that Adam before the fall was a plant? a vegetable? at the utmost a brute? Was not Adam created in possession of a *will*? That which he was happy in *not* possessing, was a second will at variance with the first. Now Honorius's distinct argument is this:—"Since Christ assumed that human nature which existed before the fall, He has only one will, and not two." Yet anti-Catholic writers will have it, that the will of which the Pontiff speaks is the divine. When should we have heard the last of it, if some unlucky Catholic had talked such nonsense?

The writer whom we have already cited adduces this argument: "If Honorius believed that the real question at issue" concerned two human and contrary wills, "he ought to have condemned Sophronius for manifestly heretical doctrine" (p. 16). Never was there a more suicidal piece of reasoning. It is this writer's very contention, that Honorius

thoroughly agreed with Sergius; and Catholics on their side commonly admit, that he did thoroughly coincide with what he *understood* to be Sergius's mind. Did Sergius then represent S. Sophronius and himself as having been at issue, on the question of two human wills in Christ? It was not possible he could have ventured on such a calumny; which must at once indeed have aroused the Pope's suspicion, and overthrown Sergius's whole iniquitous design.* The most cursory perusal of that Patriarch's letter will show, that he represented S. Sophronius and himself as absolutely united on every point of dogma; and as only having differed for a time (though not still differing) on the advisableness of a certain expression. In what Sergius said about two contrary wills, he was adducing (as Honorius would naturally understand him) an argument against the advisableness of the phrase "two energies." Such a phrase, Sergius said, scandalizes many: (1) because it has not been used hitherto by Christian teachers, and (2) because a misunderstanding of it leads men to preach the impious tenet, of two contrary wills in the Incarnate God. Since Sergius then had expressly said that the phrase "two energies" was leading men to this impious doctrine,—what could be more natural, than that the Pope should occupy a considerable portion of his Letter in denouncing the said doctrine?

In fact Honorius, thoroughly and explicitly versed though he was in Catholic dogma, had not the slightest or most rudimental knowledge of the Monothelite heresy, nor any suspicion whatever of Sergius's real drift. And we are thus able to understand the fault, for which he was afterwards anathematized. As we understand the matter, that fault was twofold. Sergius's letter was most carefully worded indeed; still it contained one or two expressions, which were indubitably Monothelistic: yet these did not awaken the Pontiff's suspicion. Then secondly, even if Sergius had

* Mr. Willis admits (p. 5) that "the letter of Sergius was very disingenuous."

avoided every the slightest indication of his heresy, it was still Honorius's duty, not to take Sergius's statement of the case for granted, but to investigate through trustworthy persons the true theological phenomena of the East. He lamentably failed to perform this duty, and by his failure brought down on the Church a heavy calamity. On this calamity we shall speak in the final portion of our Essay.

But it will be more satisfactory and will greatly strengthen our case, if we proceed to give a somewhat more methodical account of the Pope's two Letters; and if we print them in extenso at the end of our Essay, that our readers may be the better able to judge on the correctness of our account. We will but premise, that they do not exist in the original Latin; but only in a Greek translation, and in a Latin translation of that translation.

The Pontiff begins his Letter, by praising Sergius warmly, for vetoing a new theological term, "which might scandalize the more simple." He then continues, by declaring the dogma of the Incarnation, in terms which remind one forcibly of S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter. We must not however fail to point out, that this Exposition contains one clause, which is more express in the assertion of Duothelism than is any portion of S. Leo's. He speaks of Jesus Christ, as "operating divine acts *through the mediation* of the Sacred Humanity:" "*ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεῖα μεσιτευούσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος.*" These words cannot be explained at all satisfactorily, except by the Catholic dogma of two wills. The one illustration of Christ's *divine* acts, given both by S. Leo and by Honorius, is the working of miracles. Honorius therefore declares, that Christ wrought miracles, "through the mediation of the Sacred Humanity." What sense could a Monothelite possibly affix to this phrase? He must say, we suppose, that it refers merely to that utterance of Christ's human organs, which in each case preceded a miracle: to His words, e.g., "Lazarus come forth," or "I will, be thou clean." Now firstly, this is a most meagre explanation of so strong and emphatic a phrase. But secondly, in various cases there

was *no* vocal utterance whatever, immediately preceding a miracle : as, e.g., when the ten lepers were cleansed on their way to the priest ; or when S. Peter found a coin in the fish's mouth ; or when our Lord miraculously multiplied bread. No explanation in the least satisfactory can be given of the Pope's teaching, except that which Catholic theology supplies. This explanation is, that in each case Christ's human will echoed, if we may so express ourselves, the command of His divine will, and was the immediate agent of the miracle.

In his second paragraph, Honorius inveighs against that detestable tenet of two contrary wills in Christ, which he understood from Sergius to have been originated among some Easterns by the phrase "two energies." He prefaces his denunciation, by declaring that the Hypostatic Union took place, "the differences of each nature marvelously remaining" unchanged : language which, taken by itself, it is impossible to reconcile with a notion, that Christ's human nature had lost its operating principle by the union. From this ineffable conjunction between the two natures, he adds, important inferences have been duly drawn. On one hand God is said to have suffered ; while on the other hand the Sacred Humanity (of which Honorius has already affirmed once, and presently affirms again, that it was assumed by Christ from the Most Holy Virgin) is said to have come down from heaven *with* the divine nature. *For which reason*, he adds, we profess that Christ's will is but one ; because manifestly He took "that human nature, which was created before the existence of sin." His argument is as follows. This common saying,—that the Sacred Humanity came down from heaven,—shows by itself, that the Humanity assumed was not that of Adam *fallen*, but of Adam *innocent*. It is true, as he goes on to say in his next sentences, that the Word was made *flesh*, and that the word "flesh" sometimes means in Scripture "the carnal mind : " as in three instances which he gives. But the word is *also* used in Scripture, he points out, to express

“human nature” in general; and of this too he gives three instances. He then repeats emphatically, that in Christ there was no law of the members warring against the law of the spirit.

Here let us pause to consider this paragraph as far as it has gone; since some of those who charge Honorius with heresy, have strangely thought that it tells on their side. And firstly, as to the very phrase “one will.” Let it be remembered, that the polemical phrase, at issue in Honorius’s time between Catholics and Monothelites, did not speak of “one *will*,” but “one *energy*.” On the other hand, the phrase “one will” had been in use for centuries among the orthodox, in that very sense in which we maintain Honorius to have used it; viz., as expressing the absolute harmony between Christ’s divine and human wills.* That Honorius therefore should have so used the phrase, is just what might have been expected.

Next, as to the argument of the paragraph. Honorius begins by declaring Christ’s human nature to be so intimately united with His divine, that the former is commonly said to have come down from heaven with the latter. What inference does he draw from this premiss? “That the Sacred Humanity has no will,” say his accusers: “that it has no *carnal* will,” say his defenders. “In Christ there is but one will,” says the Monothelite, “because all His human acts are immediately commanded by the divine

* Thus F. Schneeman quotes a passage from S. Chrysostom’s comment on John vi. 38, in which the Saint says that Christ willed what the Father willed; and that therefore there was not one will of the Father and another of Christ, but “manifestly *one will*.” A still stronger passage was shown the present writer by the late F. Dalgairns, from S. Athanasius’s treatise against Apollinaris, c. 2, s. 10. This passage indeed, in its particular *mode* of expressing a denial that in Christ there was any carnal will, would really appear on the surface to admit a Monothelistic interpretation: which most certainly no line of Honorius’s Letters has the remotest appearance of admitting. Yet elsewhere (de Incarnatione contra Arianos, c. 21) S. Athanasius says expressly, that in Christ there are two wills.

will." "In Christ is perfect unity of will," says the orthodox believer, "because He took the will of Adam innocent." This latter statement involves of course a direct contradiction to the former; and it is Honorius's statement. "Therefore," says the Pontiff, "His will is one; for He took Adam's nature as it was before the fall." "It is true," Honorius proceeds, "that the Word was made *flesh*: but this last expression must not be understood as signifying the carnal will." This was the one thing in the Pontiff's mind, that Christ had no *carnal* will. It is surely manifest, that the very notion of Christ having no human will *at all*, had never occurred to Honorius (as men say) in his very dreams.

Honorius next proceeds to notice the argument for two contrary wills, raised from such sayings of our Lord as "non quod volo, sed quod Tu vis;" and the like. As to these passages he says, "Οὐκ εἰσὶ ταῦτα διαφόρου θελήματος, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληθείσης." Here again, those who charge him with heresy try to make great controversial capital out of his sentence. But their interpretation of it is most violently strained. In fact we can only explain their aberration by the undoubted fact, that the sentence does not exhibit on the very surface its true explanation. Before we enter on its exposition, it will perhaps be more satisfactory if we make a short but (we trust) not uninteresting digression. We will consider then how Catholic theologians interpret those sayings of our Lord, to which Honorius refers.

We shall be able to set forth the Catholic doctrine more clearly, if we avoid in the first instance that complication which arises from Christ's unity of Person, and take our illustration from the Immaculate Mother of God. For she was no less absolutely exempted than her Son, from all combat between flesh and spirit. Take any one suffering then inflicted on her by God: e.g. His first announcement to her, that her Son was to die in anguish on the Cross.*

* We prescind here of course from the wholly irrelevant question

She was totally exempt from concupiscence ; and there was therefore no emotion, however transient, of discontent or repugnance : still there was the very keenest emotion of what we may call resigned sorrow. An act of the will would at once be elicited, in harmony with this emotion ; and this act of the will may best be analyzed as a hypothetical act. " If this were not God's will, I should most intensely wish it otherwise." There was no shadow of sin or imperfection in such an act ; nothing inconsistent with the most spotless sanctity. It was united throughout with the most unreserved and unqualified submission to God's will.

Let us now apply this to our Blessed Lord. And let us take His words, as reported by S. Matthew. "*Pater, si possibile est, transeat a Me calix iste ; veruntamen non sicut Ego volo, sed sicut Tu.*" He experienced the keenest emotion of sorrow, which was ever experienced on earth. "*Tristis est anima Mea usque ad mortem ;*" that is, His anguish would have destroyed life, except for a miracle. This anguish issued in the previously unknown prodigy of a bloody sweat. And the emotion of resigned sorrow was accompanied, according to the laws of human nature, by a corresponding act of the will ; which, as in the preceding case, may be thus analyzed : " If this were not Thy will, I should most intensely wish it otherwise." Finally He *expressed* this act of the will, by praying God that if it were possible—that is, if it were consistent with God's supreme decision—the cup might pass from Him. That this hypothetical act was accompanied all through by the most unreserved submission to God's will, is distinctly and emphatically expressed by the words, "*Non sicut Ego volo, sed sicut Tu.*" Dr. Döllinger indeed, who accuses Honorius of heresy, is himself guilty of a deplorable lapse from orthodoxy, and speaks as follows :—" *A passing wish came over Him,*" says Dr. Döllinger, " that if it were whether, before the Incarnation, she knew that the Messiah would be crucified.

possible the chalice of agony might pass from Him . . . but *the next instant* the clear *returning* consciousness of the irrevocable counsel of God *triumphed* in Him." ("First Age of Christianity," Mr. Oxenham's translation, vol. i. p. 54.) That our Blessed Lord forgot for an "instant" "the irrevocable counsel of God" concerning His death, that He had a "passing wish" in the opposite direction, and that afterwards the "returning" consciousness of that counsel "triumphed" in His soul,—these are statements which can only excite the amazement and (we might almost say) horror of orthodox believers.

Now the question which Honorius seems to have asked himself, is this:—Why are such expressions of Christ recorded, seeing that they may lead unstable souls into the monstrous error, of ascribing to Him two contrary wills? He replies thus:—"Οὐκ εἰσι ταῦτα διαφόρου θελήματος," "these are no indications of a will at variance with the divine."* "Ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληφθείσης": "but they indicate an 'οἰκονόμια,' an 'exhibition for our instruction,' of the assumed Humanity." That is, they are recorded, for the purpose of impressing on us the vital truth, that Christ has really a human will. And so the next sentence explains the former:—"For these things were said *for our sake*, to whom He has given an example that we should follow His footsteps; teaching His disciples—teacher as He is of godliness—that we should not follow our own will, but each should prefer in all things the will of the Lord." In other words, by submitting so unreservedly His human will to the divine, He set us an example of our also submitting ours. But then He could not set us this example, unless He made it unmistakably manifest that He *had* a human will. The purpose therefore of these expressions having been re-

* As a mere matter of language, the word "διαφόρου" is naturally understood to mean "at variance," not simply "different in entity." The latter would be "ἄλλου" or "ἑτέρου."

corded, was to make unmistakably manifest this essential doctrine.

It is simply impossible to devise any interpretation of the two sentences, substantially different from this emphatically Duothelistic interpretation. Those who accuse Honorius of heresy, must translate the words as meaning, that Christ so spoke for the purpose of impressing on us a *false* notion of His assumed Humanity. Let some patristic scholar be consulted whether, as a mere matter of language, the word *οἰκονομία* can possibly bear any such sense. For ourselves let us consider the thing as a matter of doctrine. Honorius, say adverse critics, accounts such words of our Blessed Lord as "economical expressions used for our sakes." What do they mean by "for our sakes"? "For the sake of producing in us a *true*" or a "*false* impression"? If they give the former answer, they admit at once the perfect orthodoxy of Honorius; which it is their very purpose to deny. If they give the latter answer, what is the view which they ascribe to Honorius? This; that God the Son used language, which in every sense was totally mendacious, for the express purpose of deceiving His creatures into the acceptance of false doctrine!!*

It will be asked however,—if Honorius was thus orthodox, why he objected to the phrase "two wills." If he did object to that phrase, our preceding remarks show it to be certain, that such objection did not arise from his failing to hold Duothelism most earnestly. His objection must have arisen from his thinking, either that the novel phrase would foster the notion of two contrary wills; or else that it would at least be disliked by many orthodox persons, from *dread* of such being its tendency. But we know of no reason for supposing that he did object to the

* A very similar statement to this of Honorius is quoted by Petavius (de Incarn. l. 9, c. ix. n. 6) from S. Epiphanius. Christ spoke, says that Father, *economically*, yet not *feigningly* but *truly*; ("dispensatione quâdam"; "non simulatè sed bonâ fide") that He might exhibit the real existence of His human nature.

phrase. Certain it is, that he *stated* no objection to it, not having been consulted about it at all. The phrase submitted to his judgment was not "two wills," but "two energies."

Of this latter phrase, it is indubitable that he expressed the gravest disapproval. Now, even if we were totally unable to account for this, our controversial position would not be affected. He says no doubt expressly, that the phrase "two energies" is most undesirable and mischievous. But he says no less expressly, as has been seen, that Christ's human nature is "operative and a principle of action," and that it "operates those works which appertain to it." It is really not more certain that Honorius wrote his second Letter at all, than it is that he held firmly the existence of a principle of operation in Christ's human nature. Our position then would be quite impregnable, even if we could make it no stronger than this. It would be impregnable if we had merely to say, that Honorius most certainly believed in Christ's human principle of operation; though for reasons, at this distance of time undiscoverable, he objected to the phrase "two energies."

F. Bottalla however, (pp. 52, 53), does assign a reason for Honorius's objection to the phrase "two energies." Petavius had already pointed out the different senses of the word "*ἐνέργεια*" ("De Incarnatione," l. 8, c. 1). This word, says F. Bottalla, was used in one sense by Sergius, and in a totally different sense by Honorius. The Greeks of the time commonly used it as signifying "a principle of operation;" but Honorius understood it as synonymous with "*ἐνέργημα*," the "effect and external action" itself. This sense, F. Bottalla says, was not unknown to the Greeks of the Sixth Century; for where Honorius quotes the word "*ἐνεργημάτων*" from S. Paul, the Greek translator of his Letter gives the word "*ἐνεργειῶν*." And that in point of fact Honorius understood the word in this sense, is made probable—such is F. Bottalla's argument—not only from this very quotation

of S. Paul, but also from the circumstance, that this simple hypothesis removes all difficulty and obscurity from his Letters. It is not that, on any imaginable supposition, any sentence of those Letters presents the most superficial resemblance to Monothelism. Still no doubt there are various portions of them, to which, except on some such supposition as F. Bottalla's, one cannot very easily affix any definite meaning at all. F. Bottalla's explanation of the matter therefore—which we give on his authority—stands thus. When Honorius heard of the phrase “*δὺο ἐνέργειαι*” being ascribed to Christ, he understood that those who so spoke ascribed to Him two, and two only, *classes of actions*. And he judged this on the one hand to be an artificial and unmeaning form of speech; while on the other hand it tended (so he thought) to encourage alike the Nestorian heresy of two operating *Persons*, and the no less detestable heresy of two human contrary wills. Here then we take up his first Letter at the precise point where we left it, and proceed with its analysis.

Let us leave to heretics, he says, the phrases proper to heretics: “*τοῖς . . . αἱρετικοῖς τὰ οἰκεῖα καταλιμπάνοντες.*” [Let us leave, that is, the phrase “one energy” to Eutychians, and “two energies” to Nestorians.] And if any one [e.g. Sophronius] has used one of these expressions as his means for imbuing simple folk with Christian doctrine, let us not confuse the invention of an individual with the Church's Definition. Scripture is express in saying, that Christ is the One Operator of both divine and human actions; but whether, because of there being divine and human actions, it is right to talk of “two energies,” is a question which we may leave to the grammarians. [Whether or no however it be grammatically appropriate, on theological grounds we had very far better avoid either of the two phrases.] What we find in Scripture is, not that Christ and His Spirit put forth *one* energy or *two*, but that He works *in many ways*. So S. Paul says, that there are diversities of operations, but the same Operator. If then the Spirit Who

proceeds from Christ energizes multiformly in Christians, how much more does Christ work multiformly and ineffably His various works in the flesh, with the participation and co-operation of both His natures. “Πολύτροπως καὶ ἀφράστως . . . τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ἐκάτερας φύσεως αὐτοῦ ἐνεργεῖν.” We ought then to speak as Scripture speaks; and avoid new-fangled phrases, which may be most seriously misunderstood. It is a far greater calamity that the simple should be led astray, than that idle speculators should be indignant at our want of philosophical completeness. Nor shall any one, by vain philosophy, seduce the disciples of the fishermen.

Of Honorius’s second Letter, two fragments alone are extant, which were read in the Council. Of these the first denounces it as “altogether frivolous (πάνυ μάταιον)” to say that Christ is either of one or of two energies. Now most certainly no Christian of the time, were he Catholic or Monothelite, who understood by ἐνέργεια a “principle of operation,” could say by possibility that the question was a frivolous one. It is obvious then that Honorius must have understood the word in some different sense altogether. And (assuming F. Bottalla’s hypothesis as to the Pontiff’s meaning) nothing can be more just than the Pontiff’s comment. As to the second fragment, its drift is now so superabundantly evident, that it would be merely wearisome to take it point by point.

Honorius’s true Duothelism then is made evident by the mere study of his Letters. But there is a second proof of that Duothelism, entirely distinct from the first: viz., his external history and circumstances. Nothing can be more intelligible than the account commonly given by Catholic historians, as to the origin of Monothelism. The Eutychian doctrine prevailed very extensively in the East. Various persons accordingly,—who were infected with that doctrine but were unwilling for various reasons to break with the Church,—took up a ground essentially Eutychian: a ground however which was as yet external to the Church’s formal

anathema. But how—we ask—can any one suppose that *Honorius* caught the infection? Neither Eastern sojourns nor Eastern intimacies had borne any part in his history. He had been exclusively nurtured among Western traditions; and Western traditions, as the event showed, were intensely Duothelistic. On the other hand it has never (we suppose) been so much as alleged, that he was *converted* by Sergius's Letter. That letter did but give him occasion of expressing the doctrine, which he had always held. That he should have utterly failed in imagining even the existence of so unchristian a doctrine as the Monothelite, is among the most probable of suppositions. That he should *himself* have been a Monothelite, is among the most unhistorical theories ever invented.

Here however an objection has been raised against our whole argument, founded on our very statement. For it has been urged, that if the Western tradition were thus intensely Duothelistic, Honorius could not have failed to see through Sergius's craft. But this objection is based on a complete misconception of our meaning. We do not say that the Western tradition at that time was "explicitly," but that it was "intensely" Duothelistic; and these two expressions mean something very different. When we say, as we do, that the Roman tradition was not "explicitly" Duothelistic before Monothelism arose,—we mean that the Westerns were not acquainted with the terminology introduced by that controversy, nor had otherwise given their mind to consider the question. When on the contrary we say that the Western tradition was from the first "intensely" Duothelistic, we mean something entirely different. We mean that, so soon as they came to *apprehend* the new doctrine, they saw most vividly and intensely its fundamental contradictoriness to the Faith which they had learned from infancy. In no state of mind would Honorius be so likely as in this, to make the very mistake which we ascribe to him. The intensity and the non-explicitness of his Duothelism would both combine, to prevent

him from even imagining the existence of such a heresy as Sergius's. Whereas on the other hand if, as our opponents think, he did understand that heresy, he must have thereby been aware how fundamentally it contradicted the doctrine prevalent in his own Church. On their supposition therefore,—viz. that he regarded Monothelism as the Apostolic dogma,—it is quite incredible that he should not have earnestly laboured to put down Duothelism in the West.

Then again there is a third argument for our thesis, entirely distinct from the other two. After the Pontiff had received the full explanation given him by S. Sophronius's Envoys, he still considered that there was no dogmatic difference between the two Patriarchs. This fact is distinctly exhibited, in the last two sentences of his Second Letter. It is plain therefore, that he interpreted Sergius's views by S. Sophronius's.

Lastly there is a fourth argument for our thesis, entirely distinct from the preceding three. We will give it in F. Bottalla's words.

“We can refer to the evidence of S. Maximus, who after the death of Sophronius was the great Doctor of the Eastern Church; the leader of the Catholics against the Monothelite faction; the man who, after having convinced Pyrrhus, the Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, that he had been upholding error, persuaded him to place a written retraction in the hands of Pope Theodore; the man who suffered persecution and finally martyrdom for the Faith. In like manner we can refer to the testimony of Pope John IV., who succeeded Honorius in the Pontifical See after the two months' reign of Severinus, and who wrote and addressed to the Emperor Constantine an apology in favour of Honorius, against the calumnious letter of the Patriarch Pyrrhus. Finally, we can bring forward the evidence of Abbot John, Secretary both to Honorius and to John IV., who drew up the Letter addressed by Honorius to Sergius, and who could not fail to understand its purport correctly, while his character affords us a guarantee of his veracity; for, as we learn from S. Maximus, he was a man who had illustrated all the West with his virtues and religious doctrine. Now S. Maximus,

Pope John IV., and Abbot John, all testify most clearly that Pope Honorius, when asserting one will in Christ our Lord, had in view the Sacred Humanity only, in which he denied the existence of two contrary wills."

Honorius's Letters most certainly therefore were not Monothelistic. At the same time we frankly admit, that they do contain one doctrinal mistake; for they affirm that the phrase "two energies" is an inappropriate expression of Catholic dogma. We need hardly however point out, (1) that in his time no Pope had spoken *ex cathedrâ* on this particular question; and (2) that the gulf is most wide between heresy in *dogma* and mistake in *dogmatic expression*.

VII.

We have now, we trust, amply vindicated S. Leo's implied judgment, that Honorius was personally no heretic. It is still easier to vindicate the later Pontiff's *expressed* judgment, that his Predecessor deserved an anathema, for the truly deplorable negligence of which he had been guilty, in discharging (or rather failing to discharge) his Apostolic office. Let us suppose that, when Eutyches first broached his heresy, Pope S. Leo had earnestly exhorted the Easterns to abstain from saying that Christ is either "of" or "in" two natures; and that he had even denounced the question as a mischievous subtlety. Honorius's offence was as great as would have been S. Leo's in this imaginary case. Most certainly indeed he did not teach *ex cathedrâ*, that the question of "one or two energies" is a pernicious subtlety: this we trust we have irrefragably shown. But it is certain nevertheless, that he strongly pressed forward, and energetically acted on, this fatal opinion. A certain heresy arose, which subverted Christianity from its very foundation. S. Sophronius, who had the singular merit of being its earliest noteworthy opponent, saw clearly its frightful character; and saw also, that the one hope of opposing it was the explicit advocacy of Christ's two energies. Sergius, Cyrus, and the rest, with the detestable

craftiness characteristic of heresy, shrank from openly denying these two energies. They took refuge in the pitiable device, that the phrase was a mere verbal subtlety; and that to insist on it, would on the one hand drive thousands out of the Church, while on the other hand it would be of no service to revealed dogma. On this vital issue, the Catholic and the heretical champion appealed to the Holy See. And the occupant of that See—beyond all doubt most unwittingly—threw for the moment its whole weight into the heretical scale. Sergius asked him for no more than a disciplinary judgment, and Honorius pronounced that very judgment which Sergius desired. Instead of publishing, as circumstances imperatively required, an *ex cathedrâ* definition in favour of S. Sophronius,—he sided entirely with the heretic, on that very question which the heretic submitted to him. We have already argued that, so far from being personally tainted with Monôthelism, he did not even dream of its existence. And had he been merely a private individual, it would have been doubtless an indefinitely less grievous offence not to *see through* the heresy, than personally to embrace it. But since he was the appointed guardian of the Faith, it is difficult to understand how his course would have been much more culpable, even had he lapsed into heresy himself. We speak throughout exclusively of *actions*, without presuming to conjecture *motives*. But it is the simple truth, that Christ placed the Faith in his charge; and that on one incalculably momentous occasion he was false to the trust. This is the conduct which S. Leo II. held up, by an anathema, to the reprobation of all subsequent ages.

The fact of a Pontiff anathematizing one of his predecessors is so exceptional in ecclesiastical history, that its exceptional character has led various excellent and learned Catholics to some rashness of judgment. It has led them to call in question the genuineness of this or that indubitably genuine record, and most unwarrantably to question the truth of the whole transaction. We would submit

however, that if the chastisement was most exceptional, the offence was no less so. Once and once only, in the whole history of the Papacy, has a Pope by a deliberate and unretracted movement thrown the weight of the Holy See into the scale of heresy. Once and once only, in the whole history of the Papacy, has a Pope by a solemn ex cathedrâ Act anathematized one of his predecessors. These two most exceptional facts then have a truly significant correlation. To our mind the whole incident is most instructive, and signally illustrative of Catholic doctrine.

VIII.

We conclude our review of the matter with three remarks.

1. Honorius's condemnation places in emphatic light the difference *in kind* between the Pope and any other bishop, as regards their respective offices of guarding the Deposit. Here is a Bishop, anathematized for no other offence, than that of having failed to exhibit sufficient clear-sightedness and activity in repressing a heresy, which was raging thousands of miles away from his own diocese. To no other bishop in Christendom except the Roman, would any historian dream of alleging that this could by possibility occur.

2. We have drawn prominent attention on former occasions (see e.g. July, 1865, p. 132; January, 1870, pp. 197, 8) to the expressions of Popes and Saints, concerning the prerogatives of the Roman Church.* Such expressions in-

* Not to go beyond Pius IX. alone : consider the following pronouncements of that Pontiff. "The Roman chair of the most blessed Peter, which, being the mother and guide (magistra) of all churches, has always preserved *whole and inviolate* the Faith delivered by Christ the Lord : and faithfully taught it, showing to all men . . . *the doctrine of uncorrupted truth*" (Encyclical "In pluribus"). "In which [Roman Church] always remains the infallible magisterium of the Faith, and in which therefore Apostolic Tradition has been ever preserved" (Encyclical "Nostis et Nobiscum"). "In which [Roman] Church alone religion has been inviolably preserved, and from which all other Churches must borrow the Tradition of Faith" (Bull, "Ineffabilis"). Who is not reminded by

dubitably imply the dogma defined in 1870. But surely we cannot do them justice, without adding a further doctrine. Doctrinal purity—so the Popes teach—is preserved throughout Catholic Christendom, by means of other Churches conforming themselves to the Roman. Within the latter Church is preserved, by special assistance of the Holy Ghost, indefectible purity of doctrine and tradition, in such sense that she is the standard and source of doctrinal purity to all others.* And indeed this purity of Roman Tradition occupies the chief place, among those secondary causes which God employs, in order to secure the Infallibility of *ex cathedrâ* Acts. Now if the facts of the Monothelistic controversy are discreditable to one particular Pope,—on the other hand they are in the highest degree honourable to the Roman Church. At no crisis of the Church's history was the purity of her Tradition more conspicuously illustrated, than throughout this protracted struggle. From first to last, the doctrinal sense of the Roman Church was intensely opposed to the heresy raging in the East.

3. Perhaps in fact the origin of Honorius's lapse is to be found in the circumstance, that he did not duly betake himself to the counsel of his divinely assigned and natural advisers. It has been seen in the course of our argument, that no Roman Synod was assembled to take the matter into consideration. Honorius seems to have acted under the advice of one single man—a very holy man doubtless—the Abbot John. We submit our view on this matter to the judgment of competent theologians. But our own strong impression would be, that

such utterances of S. Irenæus's trite dictum? "*Ad hanc Ecclesiam Romanam "propter potentiorē principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam—hoc est, omnes qui sunt undique fideles—in quā semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio."* And we may perhaps be permitted in passing to remind our readers of the truly admirable and exhaustive comment on this passage, which appeared in the "*Dublin Review*" of January 1875, pp. 104-111.

* "*The Church of the City of Rome can err.*" This proposition, as is well known, was condemned by Sixtus IV. as "*scandalous and heretical.*"—Denzinger, n. 616.

had Honorius assembled a local Council on an emergency which so emphatically called for one,—the whole evil would have been averted. The Church would have been spared a signal calamity; and the Pontiff would have escaped that ignominy, with which his name will now be branded throughout every future age of ecclesiastical history.

The Latin translation of the Greek translation of Honorius's first Letter runs as follows:—

“Scripta fraternitatis vestræ suscepimus, per quæ contentiones quasdam et novas vocum quæstiones cognovimus introductas per Sophronium quemdam, tunc monachum nunc vero (ex auditu) episcopum Hierosolymitanæ urbis constitutum, adversus fratrem nostrum Cyrum Alexandriæ antistitem, unam operationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi conversis ex hæresi prædicantem. Qui denique ad vestram fraternitatem Sophronius veniens, querelamque hujusmodi deponens, multiformiter eruditus, petiit de his quæ a vobis fuerat instructus paginalibus sibi syllabis reserari: quarum literarum ad eundem Sophronium directarum suscipientes exemplar, et intuentes satis providè circumspectèque fraternitatem vestram scripsisse, laudamus novitatem vocabuli auferentem, quod posset scandalum simplicibus generare. Nos enim in quo percepimus oportet ambulare. Enimvero duce Deo perveniemus usque ad mensuram rectæ Fidei, quam Apostoli veritatis scripturarum sanctarum funiculo extenderunt, confitentes Dominum Jesum Christum Mediatorem Dei et hominum operatum divina mediâ humanitate verbo Deo naturaliter unitâ, Eundemque operatum humana ineffabiliter atque singulariter assumptâ carne discretè, inconfusè, atque inconvertibiliter plenâ divinitate: et Qui coruscavit in carne plenâ divinis miraculis, Ipse est et carneus effectus plenè Deus et homo: passiones et opprobria patitur Unus Mediator Dei et hominum in utrisque naturis: Verbum caro factum, et habitavit in nobis: Ipse Filius hominis de cœlo descendens: Unus atque Idem, sicut scriptum est, crucifixus Dominus majestatis: dum constet

divinitatem nullas posse perpeti humanas passiones : et non de cœlo, sed de sanctâ est assumpta caro Dei genitrice : (nam per se Veritas in evangelio ita inquit : ‘Nullus ascendit in cœlum, nisi Qui de cœlo descendit, Filius hominis qui est in cœlo :’) profecto nos instruens, quòd divinitati unita est caro passibilis ineffabiliter atque singulariter, ut discretè atque inconfusè sic indivisè videretur conjungi.

“Ut nimirum stupendâ mente mirabiliter manentibus utrarumque naturarum differentiis cognoscatur uniri. Cui Apostolus concinens, ad Corinthios ait : ‘Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam vero non hujus sæculi, neque principum hujus sæculi, qui destruuntur, sed loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio absconditam, quam prædestinavit Deus ante sæcula in gloriam nostram ; quam nemo principum hujus sæculi cognovit : si enim cognovissent, nunquam Dominum majestatis crucifixissent.’ Dum profecto divinitas nec crucifigi potuit, nec passiones humanas experiri vel perpeti, sed propter ineffabilem conjunctionem humanæ divinæque naturæ, idcirco et ubique Deus dicitur pati et humanitas ex cœlo cum divinitate descendisse. Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur domini nostri Jesu Christi : quia profecto a divinitate assumpta est nostra natura, non culpa : illa profecto quæ ante peccatum creata est, non quæ post prævaricationem vitiata. Christus enim Dominus, in similitudine carnis peccati veniens, peccatum mundi abstulit, et de plentitudine Ejus omnes accepimus : et formam servi suscipiens, habitu inventus est ut homo : quia sine peccato conceptus de Spiritu sancto, etiam absque peccato est partus de sanctâ et immaculatâ virgine Dei genitrice, nullum experiens contagium vitiatæ naturæ. Carnis enim vocabulum duobus modis sacris eloquiis boni malique cognovimus nominari. Sicut scriptum est : ‘Non permanebit Spiritus meus in hominibus istis, quia caro sunt.’ Et Apostolus : ‘Caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt.’ Et rursum : ‘Mente servio legi Dei, carne autem legi peccati. Et video aliam legem in membris meis, repugnantem legi mentis meæ, et captivum me trahentem in legem peccati quæ est in membris meis.’ Et alia multa hujusmodi in malo absolutè solent intelligi vel vocari. In bono autem ita, Isaia prophetâ dicente : ‘Veniet omnis caro in Hierusalem, et adorabunt in conspectu Meo.’ Et Job : ‘In carne meâ videbo Deum.’ Et alii : ‘Videbit omnis caro salutare Dei.’ Et alia diversa. Non est itaque assumpta, sicut præfati

sumus, a Salvatore vitata natura quæ repugnaret legi mentis Ejus, sed 'venit quærere et salvare quod perierat,' id est, vitatam humani generis naturam. Nam lex alia in membris aut voluntas diversa non fuit vel contraria Salvatori, quia super legem natus est humanæ conditionis. Et si quidem scriptum est: 'Non veni facere voluntatem Meam, sed Ejus qui misit Me, Patris': et: 'Non quod ego volo, sed quod Tu vis Pater' et alia hujusmodi: non sunt hæc diversæ voluntatis, sed dispensationis humanitatis assumptæ. Ista enim propter nos dicta sunt, quibus dedit exemplum ut sequamur vestigia Ejus, pius Magister discipulos imbuens, ut non suam unusquisque nostrum, sed potius Domini in omnibus præferat voluntatem. Viâ igitur regiâ incedentes, et dextrorsum vel sinistrorsum venatorum laqueos circumpositos evitantes, ne ad lapidem pedem nostrum offendamus, Idumæis, id est terrenis atque hæreticis, propria relinquentes, nec vestigio quidem pedis sensûs nostri terram, id est, pravam eorum doctrinam, omnimodo atterentes, ut ad id quo tendimus, hoc est ad fines patrios, pervenire possimus, ducum nostrorum semitâ gradientes. Et si forte quidam balbutientes, ut ita dicam, nisi sunt proferentes exponere, formantes se in specimen nutritorum, ut possent mentes imbuere auditorum, non oportet ad dogmata hæc ecclesiastica retorquere, quæ neque synodales apices super hoc examinantes, neque auctoritates canonicæ visæ sunt explanasse, ut unam vel duas energias aliquis præsumat Christi Dei prædicare, quas neque evangelicæ vel apostolicæ literæ, neque synodalis examinatio super his habita, visæ sunt terminasse: nisi fortassis, sicut præfati sumus, quidam aliqua balbutiendo docuerunt, condescendentes ad informandas mentes atque intelligentias parvulorum, quæ ad ecclesiastica dogmata trahi non debent; quæ unusquisque, in sensu suo abundans, videtur secundum propriam sententiam explicare. Nam quia Dominus Jesus Christus, Filius ac Verbum Dei, per Quem facta sunt omnia, Ipse sit Unus Operator divinitatis atque humanitatis, plenæ sunt sacræ literæ luculentius demonstrantes. Utrum autem, propter opera divinitatis et humanitatis, una an geminæ operationes debeant derivatæ dici vel intelligi, ad nos ista pertinere non debent; relinquentes ea grammaticis, qui solent parvulis exquisita derivando nomina venditare. Nos enim non unam operationem vel duas Dominum Jesum Christum Ejusque Sanctum Spiritum sacris literis percepimus, sed multiformiter cognovimus operatum. Scriptum

est enim : ‘ Si quis Spiritum Christi non habet, hic Ejus non est.’ Et alibi : ‘ Nemo potest dicere, dominus Jesus, nisi in Spiritu Sancto. Divisiones vero gratiarum sunt, Idem autem Spiritus : et divisiones ministrationum sunt, Idem autem Dominus : et divisiones operationum sunt, Idem vero Deus, Qui operatur omnia in omnibus.’ Si enim divisiones operationum sunt multæ, et has omnes Deus in membris omnibus pleni corporis operatur, quanto magis Capiti nostro Christo Domino hæc possunt plenissime coaptari ? ut caput et corpus unum sit perfectum, ‘ ut profecto occurrat,’ sicut scriptum est, ‘ in virum perfectum, in mensuram ætatis plenitudinis Christi.’ Si enim in aliis, id est in membris Suis, Spiritus Christi multiformiter operatur, in Quo vivunt, moventur, et sunt : quantò magis per Semetipsum, Mediatorem Dei et hominum, plenè ac perfectè multisque modis et ineffabilibus confiteri nos communione utriusque naturæ condecet operatum ? Et nos quidem secundum sanctiones divinatorum eloquiorum oportet sapere vel spirare ; illa videlicet refutantes, quæ quidem novæ voces noscuntur sanctis Dei ecclesiis scandala generare : ne parvuli aut duarum operationum vocabulo offensi, sectantes Nestorianos nos vesana sapere arbitrentur : aut certe, si rursus unam operationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi fatendam esse censuerimus, stultam Eutychianistarum attonitis auribus dementiam fateri putemur : præcavescentes, ne quorum inania arma combusta sunt, eorum cineres redivivos ignes flammivomarum denuo renovent quæstionum ; simpliciter atque veraciter confitentes Dominum Jesum Christum Unum Operatorem divinæ atque humanæ naturæ, electius arbitrantur, ut vani naturarum ponderatores, otiosè negotiantes et turgidi adversus nos insonent vocibus ranarum philosophi, quam ut simplices et humiles spiritu populi Christiani possint remanere jejuni. Nullus enim decipiet per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam discipulos piscatorum, eorum doctrinam sequentes ; omnia enim argumenta scopulosa disputationis callidæ atque fluctivaga in eorum retia sunt collisa. Hæc nobiscum fraternitas vestra prædicet, sicut et nos ea vobiscum unanimiter prædicamus ; hortantes vos, ut unius vel geminæ novæ vocis inductum operationis vocabulum aufugientes, Unum nobiscum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei vivi, Deum verissimum, in duabus naturis operatum divinitus atque humanitus, fide orthodoxâ et unitate catholicâ prædicetis.— Deus te incolumen custodiat dilectissime atque sanctissime frater.”

The two extant fragments of his second Letter run as follows, in the Latin translation of their Greek translation :—

“Nec non et Cyro fratri nostro Alexandriæ civitatis præsuli, quatenus novæ adinventionis unius vel duarum operationum vocabulo refutato, claro Dei ecclesiarum præconio nebulosarum concertationum caligines offundi non debeant vel aspergi; ut profectò unius vel geminæ operationis vocabulum noviter introductum ex prædicatione fidei eximatur. Nam qui hæc dicunt, quid aliud nisi juxta unius vel geminæ naturæ Christi Dei vocabulum, ita et operationem unam vel geminam suspicantur? Super quod clara sunt divina testimonia. Unius autem operationis vel duarum esse vel fuisse Mediatorem Dei et hominum Dominum Jesum Christum, sentire et promere satis ineptum est. . . .

“Et quidem, quantum ad instruendam notitiam ambigentium, sanctissimæ fraternitati vestræ per eam insinuandam prævidimus. Ceterum quantum ad dogma ecclesiasticum pertinet quod tenere vel prædicare debemus, propter simplicitatem hominum et amputandas inextricabiles quæstionum ambages, sicut superiùs diximus, non unam vel duas operationes in Mediatore Dei et hominum definire; sed utrasque naturas, in uno Christo unitate naturali copulatas, cum alterius communione operantes atque operatrices confiteri debemus: et divinam quidem, quæ Dei sunt operantem; et humanam, quæ carnis sunt exequentem: non divisè, neque confusè, aut convertibiliter, Dei naturam in hominem et humanam in Deum conversam edocentes; sed naturarum differentias integras confitentes: Unus enim atque Idem est humilis et sublimis: æqualis Patri et minor Patre: Ipse ante tempora, natus in tempore est: per Quem facta sunt sæcula, factus in sæculo est: et Qui legem dedit, factus sub lege est, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret: Ipse crucifixus, Ipse chirographum quod erat contra nos evacuans in cruce, de potestatibus et principatibus triumphavit. Auferentes ergo, sicut diximus, scandalum novellæ adinventionis, non nos oportet unam vel duas operationes definientes prædicare; sed pro unâ, quam quidam dicunt, operatione, oportet nos unum Operatorem Christum Dominum in utrisque naturis veridicè confiteri; et pro duabus operationibus, ablato geminæ operationis vocabulo, ipsas potius duas naturas, id est, divinitatis et carnis assumptæ, in unâ Personâ Unigeniti

Dei Patris, inconfuse, indivise, atque inconvertibiliter nobiscum prædicare propria operantes. Et hoc quidem beatissimæ fraternitati vestræ insinuandum prævidimus, quatenus unius confessionis propositum unanimatati vestræ sanctitatis monstremus, ut profecto in uno spiritu anhelantes, pari fidei documento conspiremus. Scribentes etiam communibus fratribus Cyro et Sophronio antistitibus, ne novæ vocis, id est, unius, vel geminæ operationis, vocabulo insistere vel immorari videantur: sed abrasâ hujusmodi novæ vocis appellatione, Unum Christum Dominum nobiscum in utrisque naturis divina vel humana prædicent operantem. Quamquam hos, quos ad nos prædictus frater et coepiscopus noster Sophronius misit, instruximus, ne duarum operationum, vocabulum deinceps prædicare innitatur; quod instantissime promiserunt prædictum virum esse facturum, si etiam Cyrus frater et coepiscopus noster ab unius operationis vocabulo discesserit.”

THE END.



Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

51.33.

AIP-2395 (awab)



